

THE
Lutheran
Quarterly



ume II

NOVEMBER, 1950

Number 4

PACIFIC LUTHERAN
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
THE LIBRARY



THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY

Volume II NOVEMBER, 1950 Number 4

CONTENTS

THE CRISIS OF EDUCATION ON THE MISSION FIELDS,	
	<i>Hans-Werner Gensichen</i> 363
THE STATUS OF LITURGICAL MUSIC IN THE CHURCHES OF THE	
NATIONAL LUTHERAN COUNCIL	<i>Otto H. Bostrom</i> 369
VOLITION IN CHRISTIAN LIFE AND DOCTRINE	<i>Wilfried Tappert</i> 382
THE THEOLOGY OF EINAR BILLING	<i>Gustav Wingren</i> 396
LUTHER'S SACRAMENTAL THOUGHT	<i>William H. Baar</i> 414
THE PRE-THEOLOGICAL CURRICULUM	<i>Martin J. Heinecken</i> 426
NOTES AND STUDIES	
Grundtvig and Kierkegaard	<i>M. G. Christensen</i> 441
The Church in Communist China	<i>The China News-Letter</i> 447
A Proposal for a Lutheran Graduate Seminary	<i>Bernhard Erling</i> 450
SIC ET NON	454
BOOK REVIEWS	457
Ross, <i>Addressed to Christians: Isolationism vs. World Community</i> (A. R. Wentz)	457
Macfarland, <i>Christian Unity in the Making</i> (A. G. Weng)	457
Wallace, <i>The Muhlenbergs of Pennsylvania</i> (A. R. Wentz)	458
Armstrong, <i>The Great Awakening in Nova Scotia, 1776-1809</i> (A. G. Weng)	460
Eister, <i>Drawing-Room Conversion. A Sociological Account of the Oxford Group Movement</i> (T. G. Tappert)	461
Bonhoeffer, <i>Ethik</i> (U. Saarnivaara)	461
Wohlin, <i>Dod och Levande Moral</i> (A. D. Mattson)	464
Barth, <i>Dogmatics in Outline</i> (J. Sittler, Jr.)	465
Haroutunian, <i>Lust for Power</i> (V. K. Nikander)	466
Pratt, <i>Eternal Values in Religion</i> (G. R. Seltzer)	467
Runestam, <i>Människa och Kristen</i> (C. A. Nelson)	468
Bryn-Jones, <i>The Dilemma of the Idealist</i> (C. W. Kegley)	469
Bender, <i>A Philosophy of Life</i> (T. A. Kantonen)	472
McEwen, <i>Enduring Satisfaction: A Philosophy of Spiritual Growth</i> (M. W. Boyer)	472
Harmon, <i>Ministerial Ethics and Etiquette</i> (T. F. Gullixson)	473
<i>Gospel Parallels</i> (A. C. P. Hays)	473
Hodgkin, <i>A Pictorial Gospel</i> (J. P. Milton)	474
Wischmann, ed., <i>Der Mensch und die Mächte</i> (E. W. Matzner)	474
Urquhart, ed., <i>Last Chance</i> (J. B. Moose)	474
MacLennan, <i>A Preacher's Primer</i> (H. T. Lehmann)	476
Joelsson, <i>A Boy Meets Luther</i> (G. F. Hall)	476
Chapiro, <i>Channing: Day by Day</i> (H. G. Davis)	477
Nygren, <i>Herdabrev till Lunds Stift</i> (B. Lotz)	477
Haugan, ed., <i>Christmas. An American Annual of Christmas Literature and Art</i> (L. D. Reed)	478
BOOKS RECEIVED	479
CONTRIBUTORS	480
INDEX TO VOLUME II	ii

THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY

Office of Publication, Seminary Hill, Gettysburg, Pa. Entered at the Post Office at Gettysburg, Pa., as second-class matter under the act of March 3, 1879.

Published quarterly by the Editorial Council of Lutheran Theological Seminaries and continuing *The Lutheran Quarterly*, founded in Gettysburg as *The Evangelical Review* in 1849, *The Lutheran Church Review*, founded in Philadelphia in 1882, *The Lutheran Church Quarterly*, Philadelphia and Gettysburg since 1928, and *The Augustana Quarterly*, Rock Island, Illinois, since 1922.

Printed by the Times and News Publishing Company, Gettysburg, Pa.

Manuscripts should be addressed to the Editor, Books for review to the Book Review Editor, subscriptions to the Circulation Manager.

Subscription \$2.50 a year in advance; single copies 75 cents.

Editor

CONRAD BERGENDOFF

Augustana College, Rock Island, Illinois

Managing Editor

THEODORE S. LIEFELD

Capital University Seminary, Columbus, Ohio

Book Editor

THEODORE G. TAPPERT

7333 Germantown Road, Philadelphia 19, Pennsylvania

Circulation Manager

ANDREW S. BURGESS

Luther Seminary, Como Ave. and Luther Place, St. Paul, Minnesota

EDITORIAL COUNCIL

LUTHERAN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

GETTYSBURG, PA.

Harvey D. Hoover

Abdel Ross Wentz

LUTHERAN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

PHILADELPHIA, PA.

Paul J. Hoh

T. G. Tappert

AUGUSTANA THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

ROCK ISLAND, ILL.

C. G. Carlfelt

Eric Wahlstrom

CAPITAL UNIVERSITY THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

COLUMBUS, OHIO

E. C. Fendt

LUTHER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

ST. PAUL, MINN.

Andrew S. Burgess

WARTBURG THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

DUBUQUE, IOWA

Bernard Holm

AIMS AND POLICY

- I. *Aims*: The aims of this quarterly shall be to provide a forum (1) for the discussion of Christian faith and life on the basis of the Lutheran confession, (2) for the application of the principles of the Lutheran Church to the changing problems of religion and society, (3) for the fostering of world Lutheranism, and (4) for the promotion of understanding between Lutherans and other Christians.
- II. *Policy*: The editors will welcome contributions that are likely to be helpful in the furtherance of the aims set forth above. It will be required of such contributions that they be frank and fair in their discussion of moot questions; that they be free from controversial animus; and that their contents be of real scholarly and practical value to the readers. Difference of opinion between contributors, or between a contributor and the editors, does not of itself exclude articles from publication since the editors do not hold themselves responsible for the opinions of contributors.

The Crisis of Education on the Mission Fields

HANS-WERNER GENSICHEN

KNOWLEDGE IS POWER"—with us this motto of an Enlightenment-derived pride of learning is rather shop-worn, but it is in process of taking by storm the so-called primitive world. It is an "open sesame" for those millions of natives in Africa, Asia, and the South Sea islands who hitherto have been only "the silent billion" (F. Laubach), but now along the whole front are on the march to something new. "What is education," an old chief in Nyassaland queried a couple of native teachers. Their reply: "Reading, writing, going to school." But the old man interrupted, "No, education is much wider, much deeper. Books are only the beginning. Books I have, and you have. But education is *power*, and that you and I do not have." Who has this power? The whites have it, and the natives are resolved that they shall receive it from them, not on account of the intrinsic value of western culture, but because of the power connected with it. The situation is illustrated by the resistance, especially in the influential circles of Islam, offered still to the education of women. The man has to earn a living, hence he cannot be too well trained. But what is the purpose of educating women? "Teach your wife to read and she will no longer obey," is an African saying. "Teach her to write—and she will write to other men." But the women are successfully engaged in removing these scruples. The schools for girls have finally become an important factor in the program of developing the natives.

We hear, we see, we notice what goes on,
The others are all in front
But we too are on the way
Yes, we too, are going ahead.

Thus one west African teacher composes and sings with his class.

And he teaches at a Christian school, founded by German missionaries!

What has happened? We are confronted by the consequences of a century old development, such as no one would or could reverse, but whose results give us food for thought. It is not necessary to think at once of the magician's apprentice nor to indulge in somber predictions regarding the "color peril." But it would be no less a mistake to hold to a cheery cultural optimism which without further ado would place the school in the center of all missionary work.

The close connection of mission and school, both historically and practically, is an undeniable fact which cannot be evaded by the suggestion that Paul did not found any schools. It is not an accident that on the mission field, among the Kafirs, school and mission station are designated by the same word (*isikolo*). As recently as ten years ago it was estimated that 90 per cent of all African schools were mission schools—a figure doubtless too high at that time; but 80 per cent was constantly quoted in the years after the war. In British Central Africa, in any event, 86.4 per cent of all children who attended school at all went to mission schools. The whole missionary achievement in India would be inconceivable without the widespread school system which can be traced back to the contribution of the highly-gifted Scottish missionary Alexander Duff (in India after 1830). It is noteworthy that the aim was not only Christian instruction of the converts in the congregation, which all along was a natural result in the evangelical missions of their doctrine of baptism, but also the establishment of schools for heathen children. The school was considered as an instrument of missions and in this capacity was able to extend widely the cultural character of the mission, even though it led to those problems which today give so much concern to the missions and the younger churches. We make mention here of only two of these problems.

The first question concerns the nature and form of education which is offered. The "western strait-jacket" of the Christian

message (W. Freytag) which characterizes all missionary endeavor is especially evident in the mission school. All instruction is consciously designed to make the children at home in a certain cultural tradition and to be educated on the basis of this tradition. But what tradition can provide this foundation on the mission field? Certainly not the ancestral customs, or at least not without qualifications, for they would constitute a "heathen strait-jacket" and the efforts of the mission to tie in with these would be questionable. The mission cannot in its teaching build on traditions which in its preaching it is seeking to eliminate. What then shall it do? Can it with good conscience subscribe to the other extreme and develop its whole school system on the basis of western traditions? Mission schools, especially those of Anglo-Saxon societies, have for a long time chosen this latter way. The results are not in doubt. The Africans who today have mastered the civilization of the West, who now are teachers at the government schools and who hold and really fill important posts in the colonial administration, have in the great majority of cases come out of the mission schools. But are they still genuine Africans or have they become colored Europeans? Does there not run through their whole life an irreparable breach, a "discontinuity," which conceals serious perils?

The dangers have been sensed, not only by the German but also the Anglo-Saxon missions, and have given cause for consideration. With the probable exception of South Africa and certain colonial areas which are still administered in the old way, there is nowhere a desire to hinder the progress of the nations. But is it not time to seek a synthesis of the legacy of the West and the inherited traditions of the natives instead of giving free rein further to westernization? The tendency today in many places is to reconsider the cultural values of indigenous traditions and to incorporate them in the school system. It has been pointed out that Lord Baden-Powell has borrowed many principles of his Boy Scout movement from the African methods. It has been discovered that from infancy the African makes education a matter of the whole man and thinks of it not at all as restricted only to book learning.

The natives have eminently illustrated G. Bernard Shaw's saying that school years were a painful interruption of his education.

But do not these discoveries come too late? Can they help to hold back the waves of westernization which have risen in the schools and overwhelmed the natives' lands? It must be remembered that clearly the natives themselves are in no mood to return to former conditions. How else can one explain that at the recent Bangkok Conference of East Asiatic churches a prominent European churchman intentionally warned the Asiatics that they should not cast their own cultural heritage overboard too thoughtlessly and quickly? It is well known that the German missions have been aware of the peril in their school work and have worked toward a genuine indigenous educational program. But they too soon found themselves on the boundaries of the "heathen strait-jacket of nationality." They too found that they could not halt this movement; they could not prevent the natives from interpreting and receiving the instruction given in the mission schools as primarily a means of making money and an instrument of a "will to power." The attainment of privileges by passing of examinations threatens to overshadow and suppress the genuine purposes of education.

This leads us to the second question to which the missions and the younger churches must give particular attention, "Does not the whole educational system contribute unceasingly to a secularization whose final result is the loss of the youth of the congregations to forces hostile to Christianity, thus producing the exact opposite of the purpose of the schools?" In any event external factors favor such a development. It is generally agreed that the era of missionary monopoly of education is everywhere pretty well past. Everywhere governments today recognize responsibility for the training of youth. Not that they thereby in any way want to refuse the help of the missions and the church, which they cannot afford. On the other hand the schools of the missions cannot compete with the far better subsidized schools of the government. So there results naturally the system of "grant-schools," originally provided for by A. Duff in India—the state pays subsidies to the

missionary schools which are often rather generous, but also demands in return a voice in the control of the curriculum. Unless it is willing to give up its schools, the mission must come to terms. Otherwise it would not be able to pay its teachers a salary commensurate with that received by teachers in the state schools. In that case the teachers would transfer to the government schools or the level of instruction would fall, and it would generally be more difficult to find suitable and willing teachers for the Christian schools. In India there are missionary high schools where two-thirds of all the teachers are Hindus!

Nor would consequences be different among the students. The students from Christian homes are by far in the minority. The universal pursuit of scholarships leads to illusions about a status of support which simply does not exist. The corruption of the purposes of education by the notions of earning an easy livelihood stands in the way of the schools which would give their students a true ethics of work. Religious instruction is a chapter by itself. Conditions vary according to country. In India attendance is voluntary; that is, one can be excused if one does not wish to take part. But there are strong forces at work to change this "conscience clause," so that application for religious instruction would be the required procedure, and not excuse from it. In such a case the Christian schools would approximate a situation which so far has existed only in pure Islamic states.

It is clear, therefore, what perils today beset the educational program of missions. The struggle concerns not only the material welfare of the schools, but their innermost integrity. It would be idle to close one's eyes to these dangers by focusing attention merely on the great and noble achievements of educational missions,—achievements, on the whole, certainly more solid than the amazing results of modern short-course literacy campaigns (Frank Laubach). It is a question of fundamentals. Can the educational work of the missions remain true to the principles on which it was established? Hendrik Kraemer in 1937 suggested the only possible solution to the dilemma, as already has been shown in several places—the Christian schools must decide to concentrate on the

training of complete Christian personalities. This is possible only when teachers and students create a real and exclusive Christian community (insofar as the state still allows freedom for it). This means a getting away from the many interests, the broad program, and developing instead a concentration of all forces on schools that can without compromise express their Christian character and are firmly rooted in the community life of the congregation. In other words, the missions today have been forced into the position of Christian model-schools, among which craft-schools may also be included. Only thus will it be possible to fit a growing, younger church for a life of faith in the midst of powerful cultural revolutions of the present. And only thus can the school be a genuine radiating center of the Gospel in the midst of surrounding heathenism.

The Status of Liturgical Music in the Churches of the National Lutheran Council

OTTO H. BOSTROM

LUTHERANS in America are eagerly awaiting a new Service Book. This book has been in preparation for several years and will contain, in addition to the hymns selected by the Joint Hymnal Committee from our great common heritage of hymnody, also the liturgies and prayers, the texts and the pericopes, which are the result of careful research, study, and selection on the part of the Joint Liturgical Commission, which represents the church bodies cooperating in the National Lutheran Council.

There is in the hearts of Lutherans in general a strong hope that this book will serve to advance the spirit of unity among us, and no one doubts that general acceptance of a common service book will greatly hasten the day when synodical barriers between Lutherans will disappear. Of course, any realist will check undue optimism in the knowledge that not all congregations will soon adopt the new order, and that, even when the book shall have come into general use, the many permissive rubrics and the idiosyncracies of bold individualists among the pastors will be the cause of much dissimilarity in our services. Nevertheless, even the fact that our people will recognize and become accustomed to the same service book will be a strong factor in the progress of Lutheran unity.

When one speaks of the *music* of such a book, the average person will think primarily of the hymns. And, of course, as the book is opened, the great bulk of pages that contain any music will be those of the Hymnal. The reason for this identification of "church music" with hymns is, naturally, that the worshipping congregation in the average Protestant church participates in the service for the most part by singing hymns.

Yet there exist in liturgical churches also the musical settings, in which pastor and people responsively intone the great liturgies of the church, giving expression through music to emotional and aspirational nuances and overtones which are too subtle and delicate for embodiment merely in the words of the office. This liturgical music of any given church body is at the same time more vital to its spiritual life and also more distinctive of that life than are the hymns sung.

In evaluating the present status of our church music, it is proper that we should consider the factors involved against the background of the ecumenical ideal in general, and with regard to the contribution of a united Lutheranism to the ecumenical church.

The ecumenical ideal does not include the thought of uniformity, but demands appreciation of and faithfulness to one's own denominational heritage and at the same time interest in and appreciation of Christian values cherished and expressed in other churches. Neither the assimilation of a bland mixture of what others are and have, nor a bigoted exclusivism or disinterested isolationism, can find a legitimate place in ecumenicity. For this reason it is of utmost importance that each communion should learn to understand itself and rightly evaluate its own distinctive characteristics discarding that which is faulty or out-worn, and cherishing that which is good. This good heritage should then be thoroughly assimilated and developed and, if need be, modified in order to make it available as a contribution to wider circles within the Christian household of faith.

It is with this basic principle in mind that I wish to make certain observations regarding the status of liturgical music within American Lutheranism.

It is to be regretted that the advent of *The Common Service Book*, as far as the liturgical music is concerned, marked an almost complete break with European Lutheranism and that it has during these many decades all too successfully weaned the greater portion of American Lutheranism away from its own unbelievably rich musical heritage from Europe. Instead it has adopted and pre-

sented, almost throughout the Communion, Matins, and Vespers, music of the Anglican Church, including the Anglican Chant.

"The Versicle forms, Kyrie and Hallelujah sentences are plain song adapted to English texts in the Cathedral services of the Church of England in the Reformation century. . . . The Gloria in Excelsis is set to a composite form of chant, which, particularly in the middle section, is reminiscent of Kyrie forms in early English Cathedral use" (Luther D. Reed, in *The Lutheran Liturgy*, 1947, p. 238).

Let me not appear to find fault with those men of great wisdom and liturgical scholarship, coupled with deep spirituality and a fine sense of literary values, who produced the monumental work of the Common Service Book. I recognize the difficulties they were facing in the great variety of liturgical usage represented among the Lutherans who had come to these shores from different provinces in Europe and had adopted the English language for their worship. The practical aspect of the problem would quite logically indicate the adoption of already existing liturgies in the English language. Translations of German phrasings would be sure to be inferior to the polished cadences of the Anglican service which had grown naturally through the centuries. And the historical paragraph in the Preface to the Common Service, 1888, appearing in our current edition on page 307, is most certainly a powerful *apologia* for the policy adopted by the Committee and an effective commendation of the Book.

Yes, I can see keen discernment and good judgment in the manner in which the Committee handled this difficult problem of the English text. But having made the decision to lean heavily upon the Anglicans for excellency of language, there was no consequent necessity also to adopt their music. True, it was probably the easiest way, the quickest way; but surely not the only way or the best way with regard for our Lutheran musical heritage.

However, I am not desiring to discuss idly what could have been, nor to find fault with the past. I am interested in the present and the future. We are about to publish a new Hymnal and Service Book, which we hope will serve an even larger portion of the Lutheran Church in America than the Common Service Book

has done. The liturgical music which this book will offer will largely determine, for generations to come, the genius of Lutheran church music in America. By the quality of its melodies and harmonies, by its ability to lift the souls of the faithful to a spirit of worship and sincere participation, it can give wings to song. But by a formal spirit of routine and monotonous repetition it can make of worship a chore and silence the aspiring heart.

According to official reports of the Joint Liturgical Commission, the present plan calls for three musical settings for the new liturgy, which are to be included in the new book. It is only natural, by reason of widespread use, that one of these will be practically identical with the present music of the Common Service. That a second setting will embody some of the heritage of Lutheran liturgical music of Europe is gratifying and cause for a tenuous hope that the loss sustained through the Anglican trend of the Common Service Book may be offset to some extent. The third setting, presumably, will reflect the pattern of pre-Reformation plain-song, more like the Gregorian Chant.

What are the relative merits of these three types of liturgical music? We must be satisfied to speak of the *types*, since the actual music as it will appear in the Hymnal is not yet available. It is safe to say, perhaps, that the third setting—the Gregorian—will be used rarely. Indeed, it is my opinion that it will be used so rarely that one may well question whether it should be allowed to occupy space which will be at a premium when the editors actually face the problem of holding the book down to practical dimensions. Moreover, Gregorian music, despite its classic beauty, is a lost hope as vehicle for the worship spirit of our modern congregations. It is too far distant from the modern concept of music. If this Gregorian setting really finds a place in the New Service Book, it will likely be because of the influence of ultra-conservatives, who will receive personal satisfaction from seeing it included. As far as I know, there is not now any Lutheran church in our country that employs this type of music, or that would miss it if it were omitted.

In regard to settings one and two, it must be admitted that

both are justified by current use—the former by all the churches which now employ the Common Service, excepting the Missouri Synod (whose music is different); and the latter by the majority of the Scandinavian churches, including the Finnish Lutherans. In any attempt to evaluate and compare them, we must bear in mind the old adage *de gustibus non disputandum* (there can be no dispute about tastes). Those who have become accustomed to one type or the other usually will prefer to have no change. And, the U.L.C.A. and the A.L.C. and certain individual congregations in other bodies will likely continue to use the Anglican music of the Common Service, while Augustana, E.L.C., and the other Lutherans of northern origin probably will welcome setting two, reflecting the more distinctly Lutheran tradition.

However, it may be observed that musically, the Anglican Chant is not ranked very high by authorities who are discussing church music from the point of view of the historical critic and not from personal usage. Moberg, in his monumental and scholarly volume, *Kyrkomusikens Historia* (Stockholm, 1932), page 305, says:

A peculiar form of English church music is the so called Chant ("song"), which presumably existed already in the Anglican church of the sixteenth century. Its fore-runner is the Book of Common Prayer of Merbeck with its compositions for Mass and Hours, especially suited to the English language. The old Psalm patterns (with the exception of the intonation), in a very peculiar manner, were crowded into a scheme comprising seven "measures," of which the first and the fourth could be extended to include the words in the beginning of each half-verse. Tonally, they were very early modified according to major and minor; the rhythm became stiff and monotone, and the whole was clothed in shabby harmony. A later stage reveals the so called double chant (the opposite of the older "single chant"), in which two single "chants" were combined, the first with a "semi-cadence" (on the dominant). This arrangement was suited to strophes in pairs and appears in the eighteenth century mostly as re-workings of other compositions (e.g., Purcell's). During the course of that century there arose also the monstrous so called quadruple chants. Also the performance of the chanting developed further and further from the original manner.

Also the well-known Professor of the History of Music in the Oberlin College Conservatory, Dr. Edward Dickinson, writes in

his *Music in the History of the Western Church* (Scribner's, 1928): "In place of the rhythmic freedom of the Gregorian, with its frequent florid passages upon a single syllable, we find in the Anglican a much greater simplicity and *strictness*, and also, *it must be admitted, a much greater melodic monotony and dryness*. . . . The double chant is an English invention; it is unknown in the Gregorian system. The objections to it are obvious, since the two verses of a Psalm which may be comprised in the chant often differ in sentiment" (pp. 340-341).

Dickinson also discounts the opinion that the Anglican chant has the authority of great age (p. 341): "The modern Anglican chant form is not so old as commonly supposed. The ancient Gregorian chants for the Psalms and canticles were in universal use as late as the middle of the seventeenth century. The modern chant was of course a gradual development, and was the inevitable result of the harmonization of the old chant melodies according to the new system with its corresponding balancing points of tonic and dominant. A few of the Anglican chants sung at the present day go back to the time of the Restoration, that is, soon after 1660; the larger number date from the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries."

Curwen, in his *Studies in Worship Music*, describes the development of the Anglican Chant: "Of however many notes the mediation or cadence of the chant consisted, that number of syllables was marked off from the end of each half-verse, and the recitation ended when they were reached." The attempt to sing in this fashion, Curwen goes on to show, resulted in the greatest violence to English pronunciation. (See Dickinson, *Music in the History of the Western Church*, p. 344).

It is hard for the student of church music who has observed the fundamental difference in spirit between the Metrical Psalmody which shackled the church music of England during better than two centuries and the Lutheran chorale which inspired the congregations and gave wings to their song—it is hard to escape a sense of that same dry, monotonous, fettering spirit of the Anglican Chant in particular and of the English liturgical music in general.

Why then should Lutheranism in America permit itself to be impoverished by an inferior musical ideal in following the Anglican pattern?

I have already indicated what might be considered a good reason for the adoption of Anglican liturgical music by the Common Service Book Committee in 1888. For documentation I quote from Edward T. Horn, writing in the *Memoirs of the Lutheran Liturgical Association* (Vol. VI, pp. 18, 19): "To translate a Service of Worship it is not enough to set down the meaning of sentences so that they shall be clear to an attentive mind. This is the fault of the majority of the versions of German Hymns which have been incorporated into our Church Book. It is interesting to note that Dr. Beale Schmucker felt the same hesitation in regard to the Matin and Vesper Services: he doubted whether they were possible without the traditional music and whether the traditional music could be set to any available translation. Every language has a genius of its own; and the genius of a language is the genius of the people whose utterance it is. It is not enough even to transfuse the thoughts into German words and idioms. No, the Word of God must be wrought into the German people and evoked from them again. And the new texts thus born, reproducing the substance of the old, but in a form as unlike the old Latin forms as the German worshipper is unlike the Latin, as Luther was unlike Aeneas Sylvius, as the Latin forms were unlike the Greek, must have a musical setting of their own. *What would we Americans have done with the Lutheran Service if it had not been Englished for us by centuries of use?*"

The same author, in volume I of the *Memoirs* writes this (p. 21): "Our people share in the general culture of the community. They wish to have fine churches, and ecclesiastical architecture and an historical service answer to each other. They read; and as they read the best English books they imbibe the spirit of the Anglican Church, and demand the same tone in their own, or that pure and better spirit which fanned the worship of the English Church." And on page 23: "In this country our churches owe so much to the influence of the Protestant Episcopal Church for the

maintenance of liturgical taste, that we are apt to think that the Anglican Church has always been as well-ordered as it is today."

Since Dr. Horn himself was a member of the Common Service Committee and its Secretary, he probably approved of its policy of assimilation of the "taste" and the "spirit" of the Anglican Church. Nevertheless, he raises on page 29 of the same volume the question, which we now would ask with even greater urgency: "Liturgical taste is set among us principally by the English Church; and its canons, when not arbitrary, are derived from the Roman. Why are these to be preferred to those of the German Churches? Why is that to be called churchly or liturgical which agrees with English or Roman usage, rather than that which has the sanction of the churches from which we sprung?"

These quotations from a man who himself was a member of the Common Service Committee show quite clearly both how much the Committee was influenced by the Anglican liturgy and the reasons why.

But why are American Lutherans *still* willing to be satisfied with something borrowed and foreign to the genius of Lutheranism, in preference to music which is the expression of the Lutheran Church itself and superior to the substitute? Let me try to point to some of the reasons.

The first and most potent reason as of today is without a doubt the fact that American Lutherans by and large are ignorant of their musical heritage. Few of those who have been accustomed to the Common Service Book know anything about any other "Lutheran" liturgical music. And this is true about pastors as well as laymen. Whatever has been done by way of crossing boundaries to explore the liturgies of other Lutheran bodies has been done rather by the non-users of the Common Service than by those accustomed to the Common Service. The law which governs the force of gravitation has been operative here—"in proportion to the *mass* of the body." As a result, one usually finds that a person accustomed to the Common Service is pleasantly surprised when he for the first time hears the liturgical music of the "Continental Lutheran type."

Another reason is the unfortunate attitude which we Americans characteristically take toward Teutonic cultural elements, preferring the Anglo-Saxon. The victory of the British over the other colonial powers in our early history and the resultant adoption of the English language doubtless have much to do with this attitude. Later political alignments in the world wars have only tended to strengthen this aversion to things Germanic.

A third reason—a corollary of the previous one and yet distinctly separate—is the lack of sufficient interest and initiative for the attempt to carry over the distinctly Lutheran elements of our musical heritage from Europe in the language and idioms of our American life. We have been, in general, far too much occupied with extending our synodical organizations and increasing our numerical strength to busy ourselves with what many would call “non-essentials.” Notice the slender hold our churches have on the Lutheran chorales, for instance.

I find a fourth reason, which, in my opinion, is based on an illusion—namely the notion that the Anglican style of liturgical music, because of its “simplicity,” is conducive to better participation on the part of the congregation than the traditional Lutheran style. This is an illusion, because it is based on the false assumption that singing in the worship service is a chore, something to which the average worshipper will give as little mental and emotional exertion as possible. It is sometimes argued: If the congregation sings poorly the simple responses of the Common Service, how can you expect them to sing the more florid and varied music of the Lutheran tradition, even suggesting different melodies for the different seasons of the Church Year?

“The latest official Service Book of the Protestant Episcopal Church (1940) gives four relatively simple settings to the Liturgy. This provision indicates a strong desire in that communion for greater congregational participation in the musical responses. The Lutheran Church definitely seeks to encourage congregational singing in the Responses of the Liturgy as well as in the hymns. The Common Service Book, for this very reason, provides but one musical setting for the greater part of the Liturgy and this in such

simple form that the average congregation can readily learn to use it" (Luther D. Reed in *The Lutheran Liturgy*, p. 237).

This argument is based on the erroneous diagnosis that the congregation stands silent because it cannot sing the music printed in the book. This is usually not the reason. It is rather because the music is monotonous and does not give expression to the wakened, warm spirit of the suppliant soul or the overflowing grateful heart.

This leads me to speak of setting two. As I have said before, we must limit our discussion to the general type of these settings, since the actual music has not yet been written, combining the text of our new liturgy with the desired melody and harmony.

The Reformers, and Luther in particular, by God's grace and through the free proclamation of the Gospel, liberated the human spirit from the shackles of a legalistic, slavish service of the church. There could be no joyous expression of gratitude for salvation which after all had to be worked out through "Ave Marias" and "Pater Nosters" and paid for through masses and indulgences. It was the evangelical spirit of the free sons of God through faith in Jesus Christ which burst forth in the song of the early Lutherans. The chorales reflect this spirit! They give expression to the spirit of humility, penitence, trust, salvation, victory, and joy through Christ. This is the spirit of our Lutheran musical heritage.

But even into the ranks of the Protestants came again the spirit of bondage, when the worship service became circumscribed by liberalism and the worshipper became the slave to words, through the ordinances of the Genevan system. While these restrictions have left their mark on the music, wherever Calvinism had influence, the Lutheran churches in Germany and Scandinavia were largely untouched by this spirit; and that is the reason why our Lutheran liturgical music is a precious heritage. It breathes the spirit of the soul freed from man-made requirements, approaching the Heavenly Father in penitence and trust. It does not permit the music to become only the dry shell of so many words which *must* be said. Its music is itself the expression of the content of the words, with the added nuance of humility, trust, devotion.

What can be done in the interest of making suitable liturgical music available for our new liturgy?

As has already been stated, the plan of the Joint Liturgical Commission is to supply three settings of music (See the Report of the Chairman of the Commission in the August Issue of the *Lutheran Quarterly*). What are some of the considerations involved in making these settings suitable, singable, and expressive of the worship spirit of our present-day churches?

Naturally, it is going to be impossible to suit every opinion and to satisfy every taste. There are those today, as there have always been, who would hark back to medieval times and reproduce, if possible, the music which was current centuries ago, the older the better. There are also those who have no appreciation whatever of the historical, but would introduce music according to the latest contemporary pattern. Neither group (I hope) is going to be satisfied with the music of the new liturgy.

Let me again quote Edward T. Horn, Secretary of the original Common Service Committee (*Memoirs*, Vol. I, p. 35):

Are not we and each successive age of the Church to resist the erection of archaic forms instead of the living worship of the Church; to criticize, select, and reconstruct; and to yield due respect to the new forms of worship, which, just like the Collects, the Sunday Gospels, the Lutheran church-hymns, and the Confession and General Absolution in the Communion, still are being developed in every age? . . . I urge this, that we may feel the peril that awaits the historical liturgist, and to defend our Church against the unhappy condition of the Anglican Liturgists, who resolutely shut their eyes against all that is not found in their Service, seek and revere every pre-Reformation precedent, and labour to invent a convenient explanation for all they have or have not, until, threatened by endless contradictions, they are driven to the faith and practice of the nought-explaining Church of Rome. There is a sense in which even what is loveliest becomes obsolete and needs amendment.

It must be recognized that music, as we know it today, has developed far more during the Christian centuries than has language. In music the changes have been more vital than those that characterize the development of language. In music an evolution of the very thing itself has taken place, whereby there has

emerged from primitive beginnings a highly developed art with definite essential features, such as the basic elements of rhythm, melody, and harmony; while in the realm of language, basic principles of grammar have remained largely the same.

Even in regard to language, however, to know and understand English does not mean that one can read Chaucer without difficulty. There are periods in all language. So, much more, must we recognize in music not only vertical classifications—sacred and secular, etc.,—but great horizontal divisions which belong to different historical eras. I quote from Stokowski's *Layman's Music Book*: "The single line musical melodies of the Church penetrated to the furthest corners of Christendom, and Vincent d'Indy is correct when he writes that 'for a thousand years they were the sum total of all music'."

It is clear, therefore, that the chants of the Church were truly typical of music as it was known and conceived and sung by the common people of the middle ages, while the average person today hardly recognizes them as music. One searches in vain for the three basic elements, rhythm, melody, and harmony. And since the chants, originally, were without harmony, our modern modification of them—in that we support them with instrumental harmony—only makes the worshipper even more prone to judge them by modern standards. But he still misses the third element, rhythm, the lack of which, for the average person today, is the most confusing feature of ancient liturgical music.

We may hold forth and argue as we wish against this demand of modern times. It is and remains never-the-less a fact that people in general—and that means our own church members as well—will participate more readily in singing, and will feel secure in their participation, only when they in their singing can feel definite rhythm.

The traditional *ideal* rule here is, of course, that the rhythm should be determined wholly by the sense of the words. The rule is good when one person only is considered; but when a group of people attempt to say or sing words together it is another matter. Other considerations than the meaning of the words for each par-

ticipant begin to determine the rhythm—namely the effort to say or sing them together, which cannot be done without practice. And as soon as the practice becomes the determining principle, it is no longer the meaning of the words, but the routine, which becomes important.

Since, therefore, in all ensemble singing, some central normative rhythm seems to be necessary, it appears far more natural to accept the general development of music as an art, which can serve its purpose in the liturgy of the church as it is today, with its three basic elements: not only melody and harmony, but also rhythm. It is a pious illusion—nothing more—that we do not now have rhythm, both in our responses and in the Anglican chants. Just listen to them in almost any of our churches!

The advice of Edward T. Horn in regard to the “loveliest” that “become obsolete” was that it “needs amendment.” And this is what in all humility I would propose regarding these “settings” for our new liturgy. There has to be modification in numerous instances, because of the very radical changes in some responses (number of syllables, etc.). Let there be also an attempt to make the musical line look a little more familiar, at least by indicating, as far as possible, some time values for syllables, instead of so many “empty-headed” whole- and half-notes. To yield that much to the needs of today would surely not desecrate our precious heritage, but might save it from being lost entirely in a future day of more revolutionary spirit! That it can be done is shown by the liturgy of the Augustana Lutheran Church among others. While there are those who feel that it is all wrong to have measures and time-values and rests, it must be admitted that the liturgical music of that church nevertheless has preserved some quite venerable and (incidentally) traditional themes from the Continental Lutheran heritage.

Dr. Reed, on page 238 of his *The Lutheran Liturgy*, writes: “The musical settings to the Liturgy of the Common Service Book are mixed in character and uneven in merit. The future, however, may produce improved and more unified settings which may more nearly approach the ideal.” A wistful expression of hope, with but slight admixture of confidence. “Faint heart ne’er won. . . .”

Volition in Christian Life and Doctrine

WILFRIED TAPPERT

THE TEACHING of Jesus came from the full heart and mind of the Son of God. It went out to embrace the whole man and to lead that whole man, body, mind and soul, back to God. Thus it touched the whole personality of man and left no part of that personality unaffected, unchallenged.

We find that Jesus lays much stress on the human heart, the seat of the emotions. The heart of man is sinful from early youth, a perverse thing, the source of sin in thought, word and deed. And yet God makes even this sinful heart capable of cleansing and renewal, and empowers the new heart to respond to the love of God by an answering love toward God and man. To be sure, the love of God is perfect, while the answering human love is one of degree, pointed toward growth in intensity, sincerity, simplicity, purity, unselfishness and scope. We hear from Jesus such expressions as: "She has loved much—"; "He that loveth much, to him shall much be forgiven." St. John uses the expression, "Grow in love," as St. Paul does also. It is hardly necessary to cite texts to demonstrate that the teaching of Jesus had a full measure of content for the emotions of man and challenged them to emulate the love of God and to become fruitful for good. The chief exponent of the emotional content of Christianity among the Apostles was of course St. John.

The teaching of Jesus also embraced man's intellect. The emphasis here is on the perceptive and apperceptive processes that help man to grow in the knowledge of God and determine his actions in accordance with that knowledge. "Who hath ears to hear, let him hear"; "Behold the fowls of the air"; "Discern the signs of the times." Such words as these encourage observations, the forming of personal judgments and conclusions, the reaching of justified decisions. The parables of Jesus challenged the think-

ing faculties of his listeners. "What think ye?" "If ye know these things, happy are ye if ye do them." The servant who knew his master's will and did it not is ostensibly subject to the wrath and punishment of his lord. Again it is not necessary to diagram the fact that Jesus gave neither excuse nor encouragement to men to be satisfied with ignorance nor to allow their cogitative powers to lie in desuetude, under the misapprehension that thus they might the better please God. Teaching, in its very essence, makes its first approach to the mind. It therefore goes without saying that what Jesus taught forms a body of doctrine that can be intellectually evaluated and appropriated. On the basis of this teaching, with essential additional material furnished by the life and example of Jesus, St. Paul developed the early *corpus doctrinae* of Christianity.

Under the influence of the Greek mind, this intellectual side of Christianity received a tremendously one-sided development. It is not so with St. Paul, although he furnished the impetus. He wrote not only intellectually but also emotionally, and valued the emotions from their own, rather than from an intellectual standpoint. Pure logic is basic for any systematic arrangement of doctrine. St. Paul's arguments were more often illustrative than logical. His dissertation on the resurrection to the Corinthians may serve as an example. He refers to the fact that there are some who say that Christ did not rise from the dead. If that were so, he argues, then the dead rise not, we are yet in our sins, the Apostles are false witnesses, those who have believed in Christ have believed in vain. But it is a fact, Christ did rise from the dead; therefore, the dead rise, sins are done away, the witness of the Apostles is true, faith in Christ is vindicated. To a Christian believer this is a glorious passage, inspiring faith and hope. It is good doctrine. Though in the form of a logical argument, it is, however, not that. St. Paul uses two independent doctrines, the resurrection of Christ and the general resurrection of the dead, each legitimate in its own category as a doctrine, and places them not side by side but in a position of logical dependence. If Christ is not risen, it does not follow that the dead rise not. If the dead

rise, it does not follow that Christ rose. But the resurrection of Christ as the firstfruits gives power, meaning, and purpose to the resurrection of his followers. The one doctrine augments the other, the denial of either weakens the other. The connection between the two is not so much logical as organic. St. Paul is valuable to us not as a dogmatician who builds up a Christian theological system by valid deductions from accepted doctrines, but rather as a teacher who expounds the doctrine already at hand and applies it to Christian living. The disputations of St. Paul with other leaders or quasi-leaders in the church were not over fine points of doctrine or logical deductions from those doctrines, but over the basic doctrines themselves. Soon after him, however, came the grammarians, the philosophers, the sophists and logicians. Then came also the heresies and schisms, and an overemphasis on the mechanics of expressing facts and truths and thoughts in language. A later day saw this development changing religion into a contest for perfection and superiority in the performance of mental calisthenics and word jugglery to the neglect of life and feeling.

Since Jesus embraced the whole man in His salvation and teaching, we must expect that He also concerned Himself with the human will. As a matter of fact we hear exceedingly much about volition, both on the part of God and the part of man, from the lips of Jesus. He came to do the will of His Father in heaven and to accomplish His work. It is not the will of the Father that one of these little ones perish. Not every one that saith Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven, but he that doeth the will of the Father. The rich young ruler who cites the law is admonished, "This do, and thou shalt live." The disciples are taught to pray that God's will may be done on earth as also in heaven. The miracles of Jesus called for the exercise of His will: "If Thou wilt, Thou canst make me clean . . . I will, be thou clean." His decisions were acts of will, such as not to run away from Herod, to remain away from Jerusalem till Lazarus had died, to go steadfastly toward Jerusalem for Holy Week and Easter. The constraints in the life of Jesus were voluntary subjections to the will

of God: "I must be about my Father's business; I must work the works of Him that sent me while it is day." And thus for His followers Jesus had also constraints, demands and commands. Their life as children of God was to be a doing of the Father's will. Those are the relatives of Jesus who do God's will. He sent His disciples, told them to go, to come, to do this and that. The righteousness of the Good Samaritan was to be judged not by whether or not he was a child of Abraham, a child of the law, a Pharisee or a Levite or even a priest, but by the fact that by his actions he proved himself a neighbor to the man who had fallen among thieves. Where the laws of Moses were mostly negative, the commands of Jesus were primarily positive. As He went about doing good, so His training of the twelve sought to make them men of God, furnished unto every good work.

It is well to bear in mind that the religious heritage of the Jew was primarily the Law. That was the sign of God's choice of His people, that He had given them the Torah. The prophets worked within this framework, spiritualizing the law, indeed, developing fundamental principles to take the place of individual commandments, but nevertheless still clinging to the law as final authority. In Jesus' day the observance of the law had become a pharisaical fetish. The Torah was again held up as supreme in the endeavor to free religion from the infringing tyranny of the priests. Additional and supplementary commandments were drawn from the law to hem around with prohibitions all of life. The letter of the law became supreme and vanquished its spirit. At the same time a system of casuistry developed which made mockery of the very law which it sought to apply. The emphasis thus came to fall on the ritualistic observance of certain commandments according to their letter for the sake of bearing allegiance to the cause of the law, with no thought as to motive or purpose, or the value of the acts performed for life. In the teaching of Jesus the emphasis was on the spirit of the law and the motive of the doer. The righteousness which He demanded exceeded that with which the scribes and pharisees were satisfied. It is thus altogether erroneous to hold that Jesus did not care what a man did, so long as he thought

aright and his heart was right. If anything, His judgments were stricter, determining the character of an act not only by the act itself, not only by its consequences, but also by its underlying motives. Important for us in this connection is the fact that the will of man, as it shows itself in performing or transgressing the will of God, was not neglected by Jesus in His teaching, but rather received a new emphasis.

Another point to be brought out in this discussion concerns the fact that obedience to the will of God, whereby the will of man shows its profitable employ, is not alone ethical and moral (except in the sense that all obedience to God is ethical and moral), but also filial. The forgiving of those who have offended, the willing service of the fellowman beyond the demands of conscience, the showing of kindness and love and mercy, the worship and adoration of God, the spreading of His Gospel, teaching and baptizing all nations, seeking humility, remembering the Lord in His Sacrament, these concern commands of God that go beyond the demands of the moral or ceremonial law. There is a general will of God that concerns all men in their relations one to another and to Him. But there is also a specific will of God for each individual life, and consequent choices devolve upon each person, whether in this situation or in that specific instance he will permit God to rule his life or not. To one Jesus said follow me, to another preach the Gospel, to a third tell nothing to no man, to a fourth, go home to your family and relatives and bear witness, to a fifth, be silent. Here each command called for a specific obedience, different in each case, yet consonant every time with the will of God.

Many purposes have been assigned to religion. It is to bring man back to God. It is to make man good. It is to make man capable of living with his fellows. It is to lift man up from the sod to the heights. It is to dignify man above the animal creation. It is to reveal to man spiritual realities. It is to set purposes and goals for man's strivings. It is to make earthly life understandable and more bearable and help to fit man for an eternal life. In and through the whole conception of religion weaves the moral and ethical strand which limits and prohibits some actions while it

urges and commands others. In other words, religion is never divorced from life, from doing, from willing. For the essence of any act is the will to perform it. Thus Christianity has of necessity had its ethical content and its employment with the human will.

The New Testament is replete with admonitions for the leading of an exemplary Christian life. Knowledge has been stressed as prerequisite for all Christian living, the knowledge of God and of His will as fully revealed in the Gospel; for unless men know the will of God, how can they do it? Love has been stressed as the basic motive for acceptable Christian living, superseding the conception of duty on the one hand and of pragmatism on the other; for love is the most self-less and divine of motives. The actual living of the Christian life and the performance of acts connected with Christian virtues has been stressed, that religion might be evident in life and righteous fruits may abound. The being of the Christian, as compared with his doing, has been stressed, as coloring and characterizing every act of the doer, since a corrupt tree cannot bring forth good fruit, and since the individual person, rather than his thinking, feeling, doing and saying, is the object of God's solicitude and of the Saviour's redemption. But all in all, very little stress has been laid on the actual volition, the will of the Christian, to subject his life to the will of God for salvation and life. We hear very little concerning it in preaching today. St. Paul refers to volition when he speaks of the mind of Christ, of being renewed in the spirit of our minds, of knowing the good and acceptable will of God. He also speaks of it when as he often does, he refers to faith. For obedience is a vital part of faith, and the just man who lives by his faith and in and through his faith is the man whose will, and therefore whose being, is integrated to the will of God, and whose life is a full and abundant living of that will.

In the history of the church we have seen the intellectualizing of Christianity going on apace from one age and period to the other. After the early controversies which set patterns for orthodoxy, after the adoption of the ecumenical creeds, after the Greek and Roman Fathers, after the decrees of precedent-setting Coun-

cils, after Scholasticism, after nominalists and donatists, came the reformers, with still no pause in the process of defining and creating doctrines, condemning the opinions as well as the persons of heretics, and developing ever new systems of fundamental theological belief. And it has thus continued until this day, till God is almost defined out of existence, man becomes a plaything of eternal Whim, the church becomes a lodge and Christ a myth. This reasoning of man about doctrines, this endeavor of man to understand and schematize Christian teaching has been an opiate to religion, and has divided Christianity into opposing, hostile camps.

Our day has seen many attempts to unite and unify the churches into the church. These attempts have been on organizational lines. They have proved inadequate because it is not organization which divides the church, which is even essential to the church. The church, organized as one, if that were possible, would still be hopelessly divided.

Other attempts to unite the church have been on doctrinal lines. These attempts have recognized the real cause of division. They have, however, sought to heal the breaches in the church by discounting all doctrinal differences, and by reaching the lowest common doctrinal denominator to which all portions of the church could subscribe. This attempt has alarmingly shown that there is only general, not particular agreement even in these broad basic concepts of religion; and that subscription to them would for the most part be equally as acceptable for the Jew and the Mohammedan as for the Christian. It remains that certain teachings are fundamental to Christianity and it cannot do without them. Those who reject those teachings have no proper claim to the name of Christian. But even to unite Christians on the basis of such a minimum of dogma would not prove sufficiently effective to be worth the effort. For whatever zeal and driving power a church body needs for effective existence and progress as a Christian church, is for the most part derived from those particulars of doctrine and practice which are essentially its own and in which it differs from its fellows. In the realm of doctrine, that which unites Christians has not been found as vital as that which keeps them apart.

World-wide attempts to unite the church on the basis of the emotional content of the Christian religion have not been made. And yet in this sphere Christians are closer to one another than in the sphere of doctrine. As Christians we may differ in our concept of Christian love, as to its part in man's salvation, even perhaps as to the extent to which we should permit love to rule our actions toward our fellowmen. But we all agree that love is an essential Christian virtue and that we can only learn to love by loving. It is truly remarkable how many groups have found themselves together for the sole purpose of practicing Christian love. Most of the time they are not a congregation or a church, their members worshipping each in accordance with his own faith in his own church. But the differences in faith have not made a difference in the unity with which together such as these labor and sacrifice to serve in Christ's name. I am not thinking of philanthropic groups to whom the very name of religion seems an obstacle, but social service groups, world relief groups, disaster aid groups, children shelter groups and the like. On the surface it seems that these are united in the emotional appeal of Christianity, by a common love for God which shows itself in a common love for the fellowman.

A similar situation prevails in some religious groups that minimize theological differences among their members but unite them in the emotional appeal, often sentimental, of love for the Saviour, working up this appeal by every emotional irritant known. In the latter case the pure emotional appeal, especially among persons who are not too intellectually competent, has been able to demonstrate the truth of the Lord's word: "By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, that ye have love one toward another." This very word points to the importance of stressing not alone doctrinal oneness for unity in the church, but also that oneness which comes from loving and adoring the one great Saviour, and making that love the prime motive in life.

Referring, however, to the groups first mentioned, though the emotion of Christian love seems to be the uniting element in these groups, the active element is really volitional, the urgent

desire to serve God in Christ, to serve in Christian love, to do the Christian thing. In groups such as these we find a rebellion against theological hair-splitting which is for the most part comprehended only by the experts and gives them opportunity for satisfying mental exercise, to others not so satisfying. To be sure, the urge to do is often a zeal without knowledge; yet we have the promise of the Lord, "He that doeth the works shall know of the doctrine." We also have the encouraging promise, "He that hath my commandments and keepeth them, he it is that loveth me; and he that loveth me shall be loved by my Father; and I will love him and manifest myself unto him." This promise may suggest for us a generalization that can prove of great value in our consideration of the true fundamentals of church, or of Christian unity.

The oneness of Christians consists in their oneness with Christ, He the vine, they the branches. To abide in Christ is to have His words abiding in us. As we keep His commandments, we abide in His love. His commandment is that we love one another, as He has loved us. It is truly remarkable how frequently the three elements of Christian discipleship, loving, knowing, and doing, are joined together in the revelation of Christ. Eternal life consists in the knowledge of God in Christ. That concerns not the knowledge about God as we may find it outlined in systematic theology, but a knowing of God as a friend may know another, as a child may know his father, as a disciple must know his master; it concerns an intimate knowledge impossible without love, impossible without obedience. Of His sheep, Jesus says not only that He knows them, but that they know Him, and He gives to them eternal life. Salvation, for that is eternal life, is promised those who know God. It is promised also to those who love God in Christ, and in the love of God, love the fellowman. For this love is to all the world a sign of true Christian discipleship. It is also a prerequisite for the keeping of the commandments of Christ and the indwelling of the Father, the abiding in God in which consists eternal life. And thus this salvation, the life eternal is promised also to those who continue in the Lord's word, who abide in His sayings, who keep His commandments, who do His works.

This is bringing forth the fruit of faith. This is the touchstone of the last judgment, whether or not in love of Jesus men have performed the will of God in serving the fellowman. As thus our volition, our willingness to obey and perform God's will, comes at the last, so it also comes at the first; for to have Christ's commandments and to do them is to love Him, and to love Him is to find Him revealed, to know Him.

Though Christians are far from united on the basis of Christian knowledge and teaching, they are not so far apart in their common love for God and the fellowman, and they are perhaps closest in their willingness to perform individually and even together, the will of God as revealed in Christ. This is in the sphere of volition, which represents the true man more fully and better than either his thinking or his feeling. It is suggested that there may be a possibility of finding a fuller unity among the Christian Churches on this basis than on any other.

It has been pointed out that when Paul used the word "faith" he often had in mind a Christian reliance upon God that had as its basis a complete yielding of the will of man to the will of God. In this word "faith" which has been since early Christian times, through Reformation times, and still is, a center of much controversy, we may find a designation for that which can prove for the future the basic, underlying, controlling factor for greater church unity.

When the apostle speaks in *Hebrews* of faith as giving substance to hope and making the invisible evident, he describes, rather than defines faith. And it is but one side of faith to which he thus alludes. Faith, in Christian usage, is many things. Chiefly, however, it is that trust in God which results from a knowledge of Him and His will as revealed through the Gospel of Christ, not alone intellectually but also emotionally perceived; demonstrated in a love by man for God and the fellowman in response to the experienced love of God in Christ; and effectively exhibited in the yielding of the whole self to God for the passive suffering and the active doing of His will. There may be much fault to find in such a definition. Truly, it is not complete, it suffers from

the intellectualizing tendency which afflicts all of us, and the churches, seeking unity on the basis of this definition, would probably find themselves, in tearing it apart, more at odds than before. But it does stress the inter-relation between knowledge, love, and will in giving substance to that faith without which we cannot please God.

"Being justified by faith (and not by the deeds of the law), we have peace with God." "Faith without works is dead." Surely in the conception of Luther, a faith that left the will unaffected, was not that gift of God through which salvation could be appropriated by men. Factually, the disagreement of Luther with the Roman Church was first on practical and volitional grounds. The church was prohibiting, forbidding, making it most difficult for its people to do the will of God, substituting for that will of God the will of men, of the hierarchy, of the church. In other words, it was decreasing righteousness, the fruit of faith, and increasing dead works, wrought without faith, and therefore not good at all. To do penance without penitence, to give alms without love, to make pilgrimages as payments for absolution, to visit shrines upon compunction from without, not from an impelling inward desire to worship and adore, these and many other good works of the church seemed to Luther but an abomination unto the Lord, not only because the doctrine that demanded them was false, not only because the emotion that motivated them was fear and not love, but chiefly because in all of them the will of the Christian sought no consonance with the will of God. It was the old, old story of organized religion, true in the days of the prophets, true in the day of Jesus, and true also today: "In vain do they serve Me, teaching as commandments of God the ordinances of men."

The prayer of every Christian must with devout sincerity include the petition: "Teach me to do Thy will, O Lord." A daily admonition to every Christian heart is the word of Jesus concerning the will of God revealed in his law: "Do this, and thou shalt live." Where many Christians have been unable to reach a satisfying answer, but only unrest of heart and mind, by asking themselves, "What do I really believe?"—these may reach a far

more determinative answer with regard to their faith by asking themselves, "What am I doing, as a Christian?" Their desire to worship God faithfully, to hear and study His Word, to serve Him, to obey Him, to center their lives in Him,—this desire witnessed by their faithful Christian living becomes a better index of their faith than the result of any introspection or inquisition.

Here is no theology of work righteousness; here is no support for the false contention that it makes no difference what a man believes, it is what he does that counts. Here is rather an attempt to point out the unity between what a man thinks in his heart, what he is, and what he does. To do the will of God is different in conception from doing what is good. A hypocrite will not do the will of God, though he may do that which men call good; though it is good neither to him nor to God. The contention is that those who seek honestly to do the will of God in Christ are true Christian believers, though they may differ in how, what, to what extent they believe, in how they seek to worship God, and in all the subjective factors which make one man different from another, one church different from another. The prime duty of the Church is to bear witness to the truth as it believes it on the basis of God's Word. That witness-bearing is not alone in teaching, but also in living and doing. Here may every church body be ever more faithful, and bear always a more reliable and true witness. The Church universal, however, presents to us a different structure. Its mind is the mind of Christ, but it is Christ's body, for the doing of His works, for the accomplishing of God's will. Christ is its witness, and it consists of faithful witnesses who in word and deed and life reflect their personal devotion to Him and reveal His life, often at the sacrifice of mortal life itself. It is a living Church, drawing its life from Christ and revealing that life among men. It is a knowing Church, for it knows the Father and His will; it is a feeling Church, for it lives by abounding love; and it is a doing Church, for it does the will of God and works and serves in accordance with that will.

As we seek for greater oneness among the organized churches of Christendom, it may escape us in the realm of organized theo-

logical thought. Their common discipleship, their place in the inner circle of the Apostles, did not make Peter, James and John identical in their thinking. Jesus was their bond of union. In a family, the individual members rarely think alike, and yet are bound together in a family unity that is often amazing. Christians can live and work together in larger and larger families, without each Christian thinking exactly like every other Christian. Not our intellectual appropriation of Christ is what binds us to Him and to one another in Him, but Christ Himself. It is in Christ that Christians can find unity, in being loved by Christ, in loving Him, and in doing His Word.

The emotional experience of being loved by Christ and loving Him is difficult to share. Our witness concerning it, however, binds us to those others who bear a similar witness. But it must bind us together for a purpose. Truly we may sing together of the Saviour's love, we may rejoice privately or together in the love we have for Him, in what He means to us who love Him; but the question will become insistent, with ever greater force, the more we find ourselves together with other Christians in the love of Christ: "What shall we, what must we *do*?" The answer is obvious; we must be (for that is a part of doing) and do what Christ commands, we must do the will of God. We must do it not only as individuals, we must do it together. And this doing of Christ's sayings becomes the mark of those who love Him, who believe in Him, whom He has saved.

There are but few Christian churches which will deny salvation to Christian believers of other churches, though differing with them in fundamentals of belief. Luther, though most vehement in his theological statements, was at the same time most liberal in stating that anyone who believed that he was saved through Christ could rightfully call himself a Christian. There are again but few Christian churches which will deny that Christians of other church bodies actually love the Lord Jesus as much as they do. If thus on theological and emotional grounds we will not divide Christ, and refuse others a share in Him, may we not seek in the sphere of volition, in the will to seek and do God's will

in Christ, in this sphere of active faith, a positive factor in our oneness as Christians which can unite us? The "one heart and one mind" of the Jerusalem Christians was not a theological oneness; it was a unity of love and purpose, an emotional and volitional unity. After such a unity we also may honestly seek today; and seeking, we have both the prayer and the promise of Jesus that we shall find.

The Theology of Einar Billing¹

GUSTAF WINGREN

EINAR BILLING unites in his thinking two tendencies which in systematic theology usually go in opposite directions. Some systematic theologians are primarily interested in history of doctrine and present clear analyses of Christian conceptions in former times without being concerned with present problems. Others live and work in the present, and endeavor to give an answer to contemporary problems without having any contact with the ancient and creative periods in the history of dogma. The great theologians—and Billing was one of them—have the ability to take ancient thoughts which seem irrelevant to the present situation and make them a living reality which deepens and solves the current problems. They are able to hold together in a unity the historical orientation and their interest in the present.

The foundation of Billing's theology lies, therefore, in a long and thorough exegetical study of historical documents, and, in what is chronologically first, a study of the writings of Luther. *Everything* which Billing the theologian says has its basis in this historical material, but *nothing* of what he says in a current theological situation is a mere reproduction. He himself is perfectly aware of this twofold attitude toward the historical material.

The historical foundation for Billing's theological thinking is unusually extensive. His book, *The Ethical Conceptions in Primitive Christianity*, treats mainly of the Old Testament. The same interest in biblical theology is carried through in *The Atonement*, concerned here with the New Testament material. These two works present a characterization of biblical thought in contrast to the fundamental viewpoint of Greek philosophy, and they should be

¹ By permission of the author this article was translated for the *Quarterly* by Prof. Eric Wahlstrom of the Augustana Theological Seminary. The Swedish article appeared in *Svensk Teologisk Kvartalskrift*, 1944:4.

appraised primarily as contributions to historical research. It is not exaggeration to say that even from this limited point of view these two works mark a new epoch. But Billing's work in the problems of biblical theology is not limited to these two books. Even in his sermon preparation his thought runs along theological lines. His sermons are always marked by a keen analysis of the text, in which he not only popularizes his knowledge but also expresses new and important insights into the biblical-theological material, even when he interprets what may seem to be rather commonplace verses of the Bible.

Side by side with the continuous study of the Bible stands Billing's Luther research. That began when he wrote his first book, *Luther's Teaching Concerning the State*. These studies are reflected in the principles advocated in the Report of the Catechism Commission published in 1913, in which Luther's theology is quite thoroughly discussed. (Billing was the principal author of this work.) Finally Billing again deals with Luther at the time of the 400th Anniversary of the Reformation, 1917. His contribution concerns the development of Luther, 1517-1521, and this work is one of his most distinguished studies. His Luther studies are primarily of a purely historical nature, and, like his work in biblical theology, of fundamental significance.

Finally, a third historical element must be indicated, even though it is not by far as important as the two already mentioned, the Bible and Luther. Very often when Billing deals with the conception of the church, Luther recedes into the background and the sixteenth century Swedish situation comes to the front. The interest then centers in the Diet of Uppsala, 1593, "the proudest memorial possessed by any church." Here he finds support for his great thesis that the Church of Sweden is indeed a folk church but not necessarily a state church. In 1593 the clergy and the people stood united both against the Roman Catholic king Sigismund and against the Calvinist prince Karl. Had there been no Diet of Uppsala, the work of Gustavus Adolphus would have been impossible. In Germany with its confessional divisions a conception of the folk church like that of Billing would have been impossible. It is, therefore, quite

natural that the historical foundation of Billing's conception of the church is the *Swedish* Reformation rather than simply Luther's teaching about the church. Billing also emphasizes the fidelity of the Swedish Church to the Medieval heritage both in the liturgical and the juridical spheres, and points out distinctly the difference between the Swedish and the German development in these respects. In Billing's ideal of the folk church there is an element of universality, but also of nationalism. This, however, does not affect the fundamental conception in which the idea of pure grace is alone determinative, but appears in the concrete description of the Swedish folk church. (In his later years Billing insisted sharply that the Christian character of the church is vastly more important than its national extent. The latter might if necessary be sacrificed, the former never.)

Even though all of Billing's principal ideas derive from history, he is entirely free from the idea of repristination. This is due to the breadth and many-sidedness of the historical foundation. Whoever regards heresy trials as the goal of his theological study has usually only *one* authority in the past, and commonly one that is easily grasped. To Billing the great men of the past are not authorities who desire to serve as standards for our theological thinking, but rather donors who compete with one another for the privilege of bestowing their gifts upon our present theology. Luther is such a donor, who certainly cannot solve our current problems—that we must do ourselves—but whose spiritual labors in a multitude of ways become of benefit to us. At one special point Billing was consistently critical of Luther and rejected him, a fact which we will deal with more fully later. Here we are concerned simply to establish the fundamental attitude of Billing to the great characters of history: thankfulness and freedom. Although Billing has found his most important ideas in the history of Christian thought, he lives continually in his own time and is faithful to his contemporaries in their endeavor to solve *their* problems. He introduces the results of his historical studies into modern and current frames of reference.

From one point of view the whole of Billing's biblical theology

is the result of the so-called biblical criticism and the difficulties which this research created. The new conception of revelation in *The Ethical Conceptions* is intended as an answer to the problems which biblical criticism had raised. Revelation is not a book or a teaching, but an activity, an active God. The appearance of natural science with its idea of causality also proved disturbing to Christian thinking, and Billing deals often with these problems. When the history of the election of Israel is said to incorporate the revelation, this history of election is not to be thought of as over against the book and the teaching only, but also as over against *nature*. And the third factor in the contemporary scene, which must very intimately affect a man of the church, was the social problems and the rising labor movement. During the school year 1908-1909 Billing lectured on "The Ethical Problems in the Modern Labor Movement." These lectures have unfortunately never been printed, but they indicate that the problems confronting Billing were the problems of his own time.

Billing has often stated his belief that the essential problem of systematic theology is "the question of religious *truth*, that is, the question of the significance of the results of these historical investigations in exegesis, church history and history of dogma, for the Christian faith and for the conception of that reality by which faith lives." He has himself followed this program. He handles the historical material with sovereign freedom as he gives answers to current questions. In doing so he withdraws himself to some extent from the biblical and Reformation ideologies, but this enables him to relate the central portions of the Bible and of Luther's writings to the present. These portions may be somewhat transformed, but substantially they remain biblical or Lutheran. This seems to be the only way in which the spiritual heritage of a past age can be perpetuated. Luther's own reformation was a productive and recreating transformation of the Pauline and primitive Christian faith, while the inner core remained unimpaired. Luther himself saw that when Paul cites Old Testament passages to confirm his gospel, he gives to the words of Isaiah and others a new meaning, which they did not have in the original passage.

It was necessary for Paul to do so, Luther insists, for the art of interpretation is to lift the Word out of the dead past and apply it to the present. When faith takes hold of the Word, new riches are revealed. Jerome, who accuses Paul of corrupting the original meaning of the Old Testament passages, knows nothing of this great art, says Luther. (W.A. 31; II, p. 544 ff.)

A student of Billing's theology must both note the historical element, i.e., his conception and interpretation of given historical points of view, and also try to identify his own personal contribution. In regard to the historical foundation two points are of special interest: his view of the Bible and his interpretation of Luther. Work in both of these fields has continued even after he had formulated his own fundamental point of view. But even though Billing's historical interpretation may be criticized at some points, there are other essential parts of his theological contribution which remain untouched. The historical material, correctly or incorrectly interpreted, becomes interwoven with ideas which are his own and must be evaluated *per se*. Billing's two great original contributions are: his conception of history, history as a drama of revelation; and his conception of the folk church. The unique view of the events in history which characterizes Billing's thinking cannot in its historical-philosophical development be found within the biblical writings themselves. His is a hermeneutic method of quite modern origin, a very fruitful method, but nevertheless applied from without the biblical material. To Luther such a view of history was entirely unknown. This view of history appears not only in his exegetical works, but also plays a part in the development of the idea of the call in *Our Calling*. His conception of the church is surprisingly enough free from this philosophy of history. In his doctrine of the church both New Testament and Lutheran materials are incorporated, especially the principle of pure grace, but it is nevertheless, like his philosophy of history, a new and modern idea.

We begin, however, with Billing's conception and interpretation of the material of exegetical and historical nature, not with his own original creations. Erik Beijer has given an analysis of

Billing's biblical theology in the *Swedish Exegetical Yearbook*, 1939. He rightly emphasizes how enduring Billing's fundamental view of the exegetical problems has proved to be. Every time one reads again *The Ethical Conceptions* and *The Atonement* one is impressed by the ready applicability of his words even to present situations. The least impressive now are, of course, those portions in which he considers and evaluates modes of thinking then current, and the most valuable is the theological analysis of the Bible texts. The explanation of this is that he has discovered something historically real, something that makes the biblical writers more easily understood. But at a number of points we now look at these things differently than was done in the early days of Billing's life. Beijer enumerates the following changes. In the New Testament it is not the individual who stands in the center, as Billing assumed, but the true Israel, the community. The relationship between John the Baptist and Jesus must be conceived of differently. The possibility of delineating psychologically the development of the inner life of Jesus is now generally denied by New Testament scholars. It can no longer be maintained, as Billing did, that the idea of a suffering Messiah was entirely unknown in Judaism prior to Jesus. None of these points have yet been definitely settled, and a return to former positions is not impossible.

It is apparent that Beijer limits himself to changes within New Testament exegesis and refrains from evaluation of Billing's contribution to Old Testament theology. But without doubt it is just the close association of the Old and the New Testament, of the prophets and Jesus, that is the mainspring in Billing's biblical theology. The main point in the relationship between the prophets and Jesus is continuity and inner resemblance, "their activity and his lie on the same plane." It is not a question of a contrasting relationship, but rather, as Billing says, "a straight line." The pattern—prophecy-fulfilment, promise-realization,—is, on the contrary, of minor significance. Billing can speak also of differences between the Old and the New Testaments, but strictly speaking these are never such that they change the "straight" into a broken line. We shall return to Billing's ideas of these resemblances and

differences when we discuss his view of history and "metaphysics of the will" and in this connection we shall also touch upon a few special problems in biblical theology.

At this point we must consider Billing's relationship to Luther, and we may limit ourselves especially to that aspect where he definitely takes exception to Luther and endeavors to supplement what Luther has said. This brings us immediately to the relationship between Billing's and Luther's conception of the call, and in this matter it is necessary to go somewhat into detail. In the final analysis we are brought back to Billing's unique view of history.

First we shall examine four very important passages: one from the great *Catechism Commission Report*, two from *Our Calling*, and one from his doctor's dissertation. In the first passage Billing has just pointed out the connection which is found in primitive Christianity between the teaching of justification and the idea of the kingdom of God. He continues: "In Luther's works this connection is only very seldom observed. From one point of view he sees clearly the connection between forgiveness and the Kingdom of God, insofar as forgiveness is that central gift which is bestowed through the inspired word through which God rules; he can even at times regard them as equivalent. But the prophetic and primitive Christian conception of the Kingdom of God has lost a great deal of its concreteness, and the teleological significance of the Kingdom as the goal toward which all the ways of God in history converge is foreign to him." He then emphasizes that one of the few passages in which Luther combines the atonement and "the goal of the kingdom," is his explanation of the second article of the Creed. That which Billing wants to set forth, and which he does not find expressed by Luther, is the continuity between God's work with men in the present and that Kingdom which is to come; so that the Kingdom of Christ is being established "through all the centuries" and finally at the consummation passes over into eternity.

In the very general form in which the idea is here expressed it can be found also in Luther: he regards the church at times as the present Kingdom of God which will endure when the world

perishes. But in the three other passages in Billing a new feature is added, which cannot be found in Luther, viz., that our works done in the calling are included in God's establishment of his Kingdom and are oriented toward the coming Kingdom as their distant goal. From that point of view the consummation of the Kingdom of God is not merely something which is God's absolute gift, but something toward which the activities of the Christians make a small but nevertheless real contribution.

This idea is expressed in *Our Calling*. There are, to be sure, some reservations. "If, however, the idea of the Kingdom of God gets into the foreground too early, and from its standpoint we have begun to reflect on what is most useful and effective, then altogether too easily we may be led to substitute for the real call of the day one of the thousand other things which are near at hand and seem greater and more important." It is added however: "But if we have given ourselves in obedience, without reservation, then we may begin to look around and see if we can trace something of the context in which God wants to put our deed." A little earlier in *Our Calling* Billing declares unequivocally that this incorporation of the idea of the Kingdom of God into the doctrine of the calling is not found in Luther. It is for this reason that he can say in regard to Luther's doctrine of the call: "It is, of course, not a complete return to Luther; it cannot be and it must not be that." *We* must "express what Luther in his doctrine of the call has left unsaid."

The fourth and last passage is found in Billing's doctor's dissertation of 1900. Here he calls attention to the fact that Luther clearly maintains the *causal* relationship between faith and works: "one clear and unbroken context: faith, love, the works of the call." But the teleological tying together of the individual deeds of the calling and a great, unifying *goal* are absent. "But from the point of view of the goal his conception does not appear unified; here he proceeds to some extent along two lines." Along one line, each man may consider the experiences and trials of his work from the point of view of a purpose which concerns him personally: the "ascetic" line of thought, that is, through the cross in the

calling the individual is prepared for the heavenly goal. But this fails to bring the work of the Christian into a consistent unity. "Luther cannot, therefore, arrive at a conception of purpose in which 'the works' of the Christian can be gathered into a whole, as he is able to do from the causal point of view in the conception of love." Billing adds the observation that the purpose of a Christian's work is to "benefit others, to serve the neighbor." But neither along this second line does the Kingdom of God become the inclusive goal, for the individual deeds do not go beyond the individual neighbor. The life in the call is spent in this way. Billing rightly connects this "negative" feature of Luther's idea of the call with his belief in the abiding power of evil.

There can be no question but that Billing has clearly understood Luther's conception of the call and that he has just as clearly and consistently criticized him on this score. The doctrine of the call is really the only part of Luther's theology against which he has advanced any criticism. It is likewise clear that the conception of the Kingdom of God on the basis of which he criticizes Luther harks back to Albrecht Ritschl's ethical conception of the Kingdom. Finally it should be noted that some of these features in Luther's doctrine of the call which he very well perceives but is unwilling to incorporate into his own are designated as "medieval dualism," "medieval ideas," which means that these ideas are only loosely connected with Luther's fundamental point of view. Consequently Billing maintains that when he incorporates the idea of the Kingdom of God into the doctrine of the call he is really in agreement with Luther's own intentions, if these are rightly understood.

It must be admitted that Luther's conception of the call as a cross, as a law for the old man, etc., is that point in his teaching which constitutes a pronounced contrast to the idea of the call which Billing outlines in *Our Calling*. It is here that the *difference* between the two is seen most clearly. It is true that in other writings and in other connections Billing does make use of Luther's words about "the cross in the call." But these features do not become a part of the exposition in *Our Calling*. It is, however,

Billing's ideas presented in this book that have become for us in Sweden determinative for our conception of Luther's teaching about the call. His discussion of the idea of the call in *The Folk Church and the Gospel* has also had considerable influence. Here he presents a somewhat simpler point of view, which is, however, very closely related to that advanced in *Our Calling* and in no sense contrary to it. For such a fundamental point of view the deep unity between all the various elements in Luther's doctrine of the call remains concealed.

What is then the significance of Billing's view of the call? On the basis of the frequent expressions of the Kingdom of God as the "goal" it would be easy to draw the conclusion that his conception of the call was concentrated around the idea of "working for the kingdom" in the teleological sense. But this is not the case. When Billing comes to the idea of the Kingdom of God, he quickly liberates himself from the Ritschlian influence and from the utilitarian and superficial ideas common in modern thought. His own unique conception of history quickly moves into the center. It is well known that in *Our Calling* he ties together very closely the ideas of *forgiveness* and the *call*, and develops assiduously the positive connection between these two. Consequently he says in one place: "But we understand best the positive relationship between the two if we repeat once again what we have so often stressed; forgiveness of sins means in reality simply this, the living God is close to us. Just as we rarely come very close to another person unless our relationship in one or another form implies continued fellowship in work, so we cannot come very close to God or remain in his presence unless—as happens only in the call—He transforms our life into a continued history with Him—and therein makes us His fellow workers."

Already in this quotation the idea of "history" occurs. In this way his conception of the call is combined with his fundamental theological idea, his view of history, with which we have become familiar in *The Ethical Conceptions* and *The Atonement*. "Still, we can point to a better comparison to explain this phase of our calling. We might say that long before individuals could speak

of a call as we have done, there existed a people, the people of Israel, who possessed a calling, exactly in the sense we have used, and Luther used, that word. Israel had received it through a powerful act of God's election or forgiveness, an act which, as we know, was ever in the thinking of Israel, namely, the exodus from Egypt, out of the house of bondage. In this act lay also the assurance of a glorious goal, which God had set for Israel, namely, He wanted to make it His people. The history that lay between this act and this goal included Israel's calling, and Israel knew beforehand that however contrary the appearances might seem, the ultimate purpose of its history was to come closer to God's goal, even as that history included ever new promises of God's grace toward His people." The call in the life of the individual corresponds to what the external, greater history was to Israel. "In the forgiveness of sins we live through our exodus from Egypt. Through it we become certain that God wants to lead us into His eternal kingdom. We know that whatever be the experiences we shall meet on the way, the innermost meaning of all of them is to bring us closer to the goal, and within all of them will be found a new message of grace. Just as the prophets mined hidden gold out of their people's history, so each of us must do out of our own little history."

History, in the sense in which Billing uses it, means that the most profound and innermost core in what happens is "a gospel of grace." Because the call is such a "history" for every individual, Billing can say that "the call is forgiveness of sins." It is true, one must penetrate deeply into these external happenings, the gospel of grace must be "mined," but it is found in the depth of the call. The Christian may see as "the innermost content of each task of our calling the great gift of the Son, the forgiveness of sin." In this sense it can be said that Billing finds the gospel in the call; and this becomes possible because the legalistic feature of Luther's doctrine of the call is eliminated.

Billing's attitude to Luther's work and especially his own transformation of the conception of the call leads directly to a consideration of his unique view of history, which is the larger perspective from which his conception of the call must be under-

stood. We must thus return to *The Atonement* and *The Ethical Conceptions* in which this view of history is the central idea. Nowhere else has Billing so thoroughly and clearly presented this view. These books are earlier than the little pamphlet, *Our Calling*.

"Faith in the God who lives and works in history is first and last in Billing's theology." After he has formulated this view in *The Ethical Conceptions*, it penetrates practically everything which later becomes the object of his interest. It is not possible here to give a complete presentation of his thought. We limit ourselves to his biblical theology, and especially to one central aspect. Billing's chief problem is: how can grace and judgment, grace and righteousness, grace and severity be united in such a way that neither loses its incisiveness and its purity, or becomes lost? One common example of a false combination is the following: the idea of recompense is used as the foundation for the relationship between God and man, and grace stands at the side and forgives what is still lacking in man's righteousness. But in that case the grace of God is not election, and God's righteousness becomes a power that competes with his love. In the prophets righteousness and mercy are not separated. The judge who secures justice for the oppressed is righteous. Historical events are the prophets' source of knowledge; and especially that event with which the history of Israel begins, the crossing of the Red Sea. What happened there is regarded as a divine act of judgment through which God secures justice for his unjustly oppressed people. History itself has tied the two demands of righteousness and mercy so closely together for Israel. The Lord demands justice and mercy also of his people. The prophets proclaim continuously these demands, and no others.

The passage through the Red Sea is God's act of election with regard to his people. In reality it becomes clear that this specific prophetic view of the unity of righteousness and grace can be maintained only as long as historical acts of election of this kind are vitally real for Israel and its leaders. In Judaism this unity disintegrates; there righteousness becomes one thing and mercy another; on the one hand, recompense, and on the other, indulgent

leniency. But when this happens in the *thinking* of the people, the reason is that the external *history* has already appeared void of such deeds in which they could see, as of old, the righteous Lord dealing in grace with his own people. This is the tragedy of Judaism.

In the presence of the *fact* of the act of election grace and righteousness are tied together: "the thoughts are immediately tied together in this way, and cannot appear in any other fashion." "When the certainty of such a fact is lacking in the external history, no effort of thought is able to preserve the unity." The miracle at the Red Sea, therefore, creates this unity of grace and justice. In the Exile, history is silent, and this unity is lost; but it returns again when Cyrus conquers Babylon and permits the Jews to return. "In spite of his exalted majesty, in spite of the sin of the people, the Lord stood there among them in incomprehensible mercy. His presence was simply a fact. He had performed an act the like of which Israel had not seen since the day of the Red Sea. He had called upon the eagle from the far country and on the hero of the East." The true significance of this historical event was explained to the people in the prophecy of Deutero-Isaiah, in which grace and righteousness are united. After that the external history of Judaism remains silent, and grace is divorced from righteousness.

The next time such a fact confronts the people, testifying of God's presence in the course of history, is when Jesus appears with his message. Jesus himself is determined by the act of the Father; his work is election, forgiveness, but at the same time unyielding severity. From this point of view Billing establishes a direct parallel between the prophecy of Deutero-Isaiah and the proclamation of Jesus: a unity of grace and righteousness. But it is not only the proclamation of Jesus that is characterized by this unity; also his activity, his life and his death, are an objective unity of judgment and forgiveness. This activity, this fact which through the resurrection of Christ has become a continuously living fact, is interpreted by Paul who likewise maintains this unity of grace and righteousness, a unity established by history

itself, by Christ, and by this deed which God through him has accomplished. Deutero-Isaiah, Jesus, and Paul follow the same line in their proclamation. That which is unique in Billing's view of history appears most clearly in his analysis of IV Esdras. There are many remarkable similarities between this book, Deutero-Isaiah, and Paul; in fact, all the elements which belong in the prophetic, biblical context of grace and righteousness are found in IV Esdras, except one: election, the idea of forgiveness. Why is this absent? Because IV Esdras has not stood in the presence of and has not seen God's new act of election in Christ. The history which IV Esdras knows is silent and without grace. God's activity in the external history is missing.

But if such an act of God has taken place—salvation out of Egypt, return from the Exile, or the sending of Christ—then the ideas of grace and righteousness are tied together. But the question then comes: is there any difference in the conception of this unity as found in the Old Testament and in the New? How are the differences between Deutero-Isaiah and Paul to be indicated? How does the idea of grace in Jesus' teaching differ from the same conception in the Old Testament prophets? Here the whole range of Billing's words about "a straight line" between the prophets and Jesus, between the old and the new, becomes apparent. The inner balance between mercy and righteousness, and the very significance of these ideas are the same from beginning to end; and consequently there is, from this point of view, in principle nothing new as we pass from the Old Testament to primitive Christianity. Grace is the same in the prophets and in Jesus, if we disregard the object toward which his grace is directed. What is then the principal difference between the Old and the New Testament? The consistent answer to this question is: in the Old Testament prophets God's election concerns *the people*, Israel; but the act of Christ means that *the individual* has an election in which he can trust, viz., the forgiveness of sins which the Son of Man has power to give. In the forgiveness of sins the individual experiences his exodus out of Egypt. Forgiveness is for the individual what the passing through the Red

Sea was for Israel. The risen Christ continues always through the centuries his election of individuals through the forgiveness of sins.

When Christ bestows forgiveness of sins upon the individual, he fulfills a mission given to him by God. Such a mission no prophet in the Old Testament could assume. When Jesus receives and fulfills this mission, then the time of the prophets is past. From this point of view Billing declares that the difference between Jesus and the prophets is not a difference in degree but in kind. It can be said that Jesus not only proclaims God's act of election, but that he accomplishes it. What happens through Christ does not correspond to what happens in the Old Testament through the prophets; for what corresponds to his act is the fact, the event, which meant for Israel salvation out of Egypt and the passing through the Red Sea. Both the work of Christ and the salvation of Israel from the land of slavery are acts of election performed by God himself. As the prophets interpret God's acts of election with reference to Israel, so Paul, as a New Testament prophet, interprets God's act of election in Christ with reference to the sinner. The most important difference between Paul and Isaiah lies in the fact that Paul places the relation of the individual to God in the foreground. Paul supplies an interpretation of the work of Christ which is in agreement with what Jesus taught about himself. Through Christ God removes the limitation of the act of election which confined it to the people. Since now the risen Christ continues his work century after century among all the peoples on the earth, grace is now offered to every individual and to *all* men.

Grace and righteousness, or mercy and justice in Billing's theology are not merely ideas in different historical combinations but the very reality itself. When the prophets, Jesus, and Paul tie grace and righteousness together into a unity, it is grace and righteousness themselves which *in God* are a unity and which now *become* a unity also in human thinking, because God comes near and is active in history in a new external event. This is the significance of history, of the divine deed and of the external fact. If

grace and righteousness could be continued simply as an experiment in thinking, then Billing's biblical theology would be concerned simply with the thoughts of the biblical characters. But now God's own activity enters, by way of the conception of history, into that unity of grace and righteousness which biblical thought at its highest is able to achieve. This unity of thought must have its foundation in one of the Lord's mighty acts of mercy. If this foundation is lacking, no effort of thought is able to hold grace and righteousness together in a unity. It is for this reason that Billing is not interested in the question whether the content of the conception of righteousness in the New Testament differs from that found in the old Israel; nor in the question whether the significance of grace is different in the New Testament than in the prophets. Billing deals with grace and righteousness themselves, which to be sure have a history, but which in themselves are identical throughout the Bible. He is dealing with that reality which is God's grace, which in the Old Testament elects *the people*, and in the New Testament elects *the individual*, but which in all this is and remains the grace of God.

The unity of the will of God becomes, therefore, very emphatically expressed in Billing's theology. His view of history, which is applied both to the Old and the New Testament material, makes this unity so natural and obvious that it needs only be presupposed and furthermore is confirmed by the result: the material actually fits into this pattern. But this unity in the will of God is not only a unity between the Old and the New Testament; it is also a unity between two phases in the divine will: grace and judgment, love and severity, both of which become for Billing one, viz., forgiveness. The unity is achieved under the rubric of grace and mercy, not of judgment and law. Unmerited grace is primary and central in God's every act of election, just as in the death of Jesus. A message of grace lies as a foundation in every event which is included in God's election of a people or of an individual.

Billing incorporates his doctrine of the call into this view of history. The experiences which encompass the individual Christian

are a history containing God's will and grace. As we learn from the interpretation of the biblical history, this history of the individual Christian is not so much a task as a gift. Man does not by his own effort establish the kingdom of God, for something is given and bestowed through those experiences which determine his life. When I look back on my life's events, I can see how they have marked the way of the forgiveness of sins into my life. To be sure, it is not always easy to perceive this in the confusion of events. One's history must be worked through from a religious point of view. When this is done, it will be found that even out of the very darkest period, even such as a seventy years' exile when all hope seems vain, there will arise unexpectedly a rich and deep experience of grace. In this struggle to see the significance of one's own history in a right perspective the similarity with Israel's history appears most clearly. Here there is not simply grace, but grace and severity in a real unity.

When the call is conceived of in this way as something dark and demanding which must be worked through from a religious point of view, the idea of the call is still comprised within his view of history, and its deepest and innermost content is even then grace, gospel, and forgiveness of sins. Something of Luther's interpretation of the call is no doubt also present, especially when Billing distinguishes the call and forgiveness as the two poles between which the process of sanctification proceeds. But wherever this line of thought occurs, it immediately passes over into the other and the original: the call as containing a message of grace and a gift, not primarily commandment and law. In Billing's conception of the call this tension between burden and gift is always resolved in a manner that is analogous to the synthesis between grace and righteousness in *The Ethical Conceptions* and in *The Atonement*. In principle and in its innermost meaning the call is for Billing always a gospel, a gift, the forgiveness of sins. His conception of the call is a variant of his unique view of history. Even if the pamphlet, *Our Calling*, appears obscure, or, as N. O. Jensen has said, is more strongly influenced by contemporary thinking than Billing's other works, the reason is

not that it represents a departure from his customary line of thinking. The reason that *Our Calling* produces such a peculiar impression is, no doubt, that Billing's view of history cannot actually be applied to the Lutheran conception of the call as this was originally formulated, while this same view of history is compatible with and fruitful in the interpretation of the prophets.

Luther's Sacramental Thought

WILLIAM H. BAAR

IN Harnack's *History of Dogma*, the section treating Luther's teaching on the Holy Eucharist is entitled, "The Catholic elements retained by Luther along with and in his Christianity."¹ Here is the obvious implication that Luther's sacramental thought represents a strange and contradictory conservatism hardly capable of entering into fruitful interrelation with the principal of "justification by faith." Another writer says, "Luther, notwithstanding his high moral eminence, his study of the Scriptures . . . and his clear enunciation of the great Gospel truth . . . , never rose above the doctrine . . . that the Body and Blood of Christ are really in or with the bread and wine."² D'Aubigne has an interesting comment in a similar vein. He writes, "Luther purified the Church of its Jewish element, i.e. that which related to the doctrine of man—Zwingli purified that Church of paganism, i.e. symbols, images, ceremonies . . . etc."³ Here again Luther is presented as a man who saw only part of the Reformation truth. He apparently could not rid himself of the elements borrowed from pre-Christian Rome. Thus Luther's sacramental teaching exists as a queer anachronism in the midst of an otherwise laudable and coherent exposition of profound religious experience. Luther's critics find here an example "par excellence" of Spengler's idea of the "pseudomorphosis"⁴ in which the white-hot flowing stream of a direct and meaningful apprehension of God's forgiving grace was forced into a channel too well worn, so that it underwent untimely calcification and curious distortion in molds uncongenial

1 Harnack, A., *History of Dogma*, tr. William M'Gilchrist (Oxford: Williams and Norgate, 1899), Vol I, p. 230.

2 Jacob, G. A., *The Lord's Supper* (London: Henry Frowde, 1884), p. 47.

3 D'Aubigne, Merle J. H., *History of the Reformation*, tr. H. White (New York: Hurst and Co.), Vol. III, pp. 243 f.

4 Spengler, O., *The Decline of the West*, tr. Ellinor James (New York: Alfred Knopf, 1932), Vol. II, p. 189.

to spirit and life. Brilioth summarizes the situation when he says, "Above all, in the Eucharistic doctrine and practice of Lutheranism, we have been asked to see a supreme example of the power of the old forms to bind even Luther's strong spirit in chains."⁵

Now having recognized this "strange contradiction" in Luther's religious outlook, critics have advanced various and sundry explanations. Grisar, speaking of the controversy between Luther and Zwingli, finds that Luther manifests two characteristic traits, one being a "credulous tendency involving even his acceptance of the miraculous and incomprehensible features of the doctrine of the Eucharist."⁶ Even Koestlin says, regarding the same controversy, that one is "justified in asking whether Luther really understood what he maintained; especially whether he had a definite and clear idea of what we call the distinction between the real and merely the dynastic presence."⁷ So we have a credulous tendency and possible misunderstanding given as partial explanations of the conservatism and obscurity of Luther's eucharistic doctrine. Brilioth adds another element when he says that we will not understand Luther's view, unless we can appreciate intuitively the impressions which monastic life had on him.⁸ Scheel says that Luther's posture remained that of a schoolman who rejected a given theory, but could not escape the scholastic limitations which it implied.⁹ According to W. Koehler, one powerful motive for Luther's refusal to accept a symbolical interpretation of the words of consecration was his jealousy of Carlstadt who had been the first of the Wittenbergers to advance the idea.¹⁰ A contemporary account says that Luther would have adopted the doctrine of the symbolic presence "had he not been prevented (antici-

5 Brilioth, Yngve, *Eucharistic Faith and Practice Evangelical and Catholic*, tr. A. G. Herbert (London: S.P.C.K., 1939), p. 94.

6 Grisar, H., *Luther*, tr. E. M. Lamond (St. Louis, Mo.: B. Herder, 1913), pp. 341 ff.

7 Koestlin, J., *M. Luther*, 5th ed. (Berlin: 1903), Vol. II, pp. 100 f.

8 Brilioth, *op. cit.*, p. 95.

9 Scheel, O., "Abendmahl" in *Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, Vol. I, pp. 70 ff., quoted from Preserved Smith's, *A Short History of Christian Theophagy* (Chicago: The Open Court Pub. Co., 1922), p. 105.

10 Koehler, W., "Zum Abendmahlsstreite zwischen Luther und Zwingli," *Lutherstudien*, 1917, p. 116, quoted from Preserved Smith, *op. cit.*, p. 103.

pated) by this Carolstadius, whome the wicked arrogancy of his stomake could not suffer to be auctour of so hye a heresy, whereof he coveted him selfe to have been father."¹¹

Another reason for Luther's conservatism in eucharistic thought is given by Grisar and purports to be from Luther, himself. Grisar says, "He pretends to have gained a most intimate conviction of the Real Presence of Christ by personal experience, nay, even to have been instructed in this truth by angels."¹² An article in the *American Journal of Psychology* for July, 1913, states that Luther was obsessed by the dread of everlasting torture,¹³ and Harnack agrees with this, saying that the need for assurance was so overwhelmingly strong that he needed something supernatural and miraculous in order to make salvation certain.¹⁴ Whatever Luther's reasons may have been, Troeltsch is convinced that he compromised his position of "faith alone" by making the means more important than the end,¹⁵ and Harnack says that he made the tyranny of dogma unbearable and opened the door to a narrow and loveless orthodoxy, in short, to all those things which, at other times, he attacked so vigorously in the old Church.¹⁶

As this exposition continues, the justice or injustice of these criticisms will become increasingly apparent. Here, however, it is "apropos" to note a certain superficiality underlying all of these criticisms of Luther's pseudo-Medievalism. These scholars seem to attempt to understand Luther more in the light of their own presuppositions than of his. To pursue such a policy is to misunderstand Luther. The factors which these scholars mention may have all contributed to Luther's doctrine of the Eucharist, but they seem more secondary than primary, i.e. more like symptoms than causes. It is true that Luther may not have been as modern as his critics and that the authority and tradition of the Church had a great hold upon him. He may have been considerably credul-

11 Barlowe, *Dialogue*, 1553, quoted from Preserved Smith, *op. cit.*, p. 103.

12 Grisar, *op. cit.*, p. 344.

13 Quoted from Preserved Smith, *op. cit.*, p. 104.

14 Harnack, *op. cit.*, pp. 261, 264.

15 Troeltsch, E., *Protestantism and Progress*, 1912, pp. 192 f., quoted from Preserved Smith, *op. cit.*, p. 105.

16 Harnack, *op. cit.*, p. 260.

ous and naive, too, but can it not be admitted, at the same time, that his simple acceptance of the real presence and his reluctance to speculate upon its mode was more Pauline than either the philosophic speculations of Roman Scholasticism or the philosophic doubts of Zwinglianism?¹⁷

There are some very profound and fundamental presuppositions underlying Luther's doctrine of the Sacraments. These presuppositions have an organic relation to the whole of Luther's thought and, no less, to his eucharistic thought. This does not mean that Luther may not have fallen into error and inconsistency in his exposition of the doctrine. It does mean that, whatever its faults, Luther's eucharistic doctrine is neither a chance preservation of ancient superstition nor a set of ideas alien to his own better thought.

Our first task in this paper will be to examine the presuppositions which underlie the sacramental thought of Luther so that we might see his thorough-going sacramentalism, not as a contradictory anachronism, but as an essential and integral element in his thought.

In the first place the doctrine of the creation of the world by God involves Luther in a frank and enthusiastic acceptance of matter as good. Matter and spirit are two things, but the distinction is not of religious importance. In Luther there is scarcely any trace of metaphysical dualism. There is a religious dualism involving sin and grace, but this is never presented as involving an opposition of spirit and nature. Spirit and nature are both of God, and, as such, both are good. Thus in Luther we have a most concrete and vivid presentation of the state of man before the Fall. Reinhold Niebuhr says, "He allows his imagination to run riot . . . and insists that it (this state) included remarkable attributes of physical perfection as well as of mental and spiritual endowments. Adam 'had powers of vision exceeding those of a lynx' and 'handled lions and bears being stronger than they, as we handle the young of any animal' ."¹⁸ Likewise, Luther pictures the

17 Brilioth, *op. cit.*, p. 102.

18 Niebuhr, Reinhold, *The Nature and Destiny of Man* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1942), Vol. I, p. 160 f. Niebuhr quotes from the Commentary on Genesis, part IV, II, V, 26 ff.

body after the resurrection from the dead as having eyes that can look through a mountain and ears that can hear from one end of the world to another.¹⁹ There will be a new sun and a new moon and new stars; also water, trees and grass far more beautiful and, according to the *Tischreden*, also new animals—little dogs with golden hair, etc.²⁰ In all of this Luther reminds one of St. Irenaeus.

The present world, according to Luther, was not all darkness, either. For him the beauties of nature were capable of begetting a strong, spiritual fervor. There is a great similarity to St. Francis here. St. Francis may have preached to the birds; Luther said that the birds preached to him. St. Francis wrote a hymn to the sun, and Luther rejoiced at the firmament of night's starry heaven which fell not, even though no pillars held it up. Luther could say with joy that God was in all things. The doctrine of ubiquity is no doubt related to this enthusiastic naturalism. Certainly the presence of God in this world is affirmed and God's remoteness denied. In this, too, we will see Luther's aversion to thinking of God as on a throne far away. God is hidden, but he inhabits all created things, for he is "logos."

So, we have a naturalism and a materialism in Luther which makes the relation between matter and spirit a congenial one. Matter might well be the vehicle of spirit. It is significant that Luther was attacked on both sides for his materialism. The Roman Church said that because the Body of Christ was present, there could be no bread; Münzer said because bread was present, there could be no Body. Both hesitated to associate God with matter. Luther simply pointed to the Incarnation. God became man—therefore, flesh and blood are good.

This brings us to the doctrine of the Incarnation. Here again Luther shows great respect for the natural and the historical. In the Incarnation nature and spirit are in perfect union. "I have

19 *Erl. Ed.*, IV, 2 sq.; XIX, p. 134; LI, p. 183, quoted from Koestlin, J., *The Theology of Luther*, tr. C. E. Hay (Philadelphia: Lutheran Publication Society, 1899), Vol. II, p. 582. This book is used so frequently that hereafter except where the work appears alone, the abbreviation, K.I. or K.II. with the page number following will refer to volumes one and two of this work respectively.

20 *Erl. Ed.*, X, 74. *Op. Ex.*, X, 392. *Erl. Ed.*, XXXIX, 35; LI, 243; IX, 106; LI, 183. *Tischr.*, IV, 289 sq.; K.I. 583.

no God," Luther says, "whether in heaven or in earth, and I know of none outside the Flesh that lies in the bosom of the Virgin Mary."²¹ For Luther, Christ's Person and work are fastened together in an indissoluble bond. A view of Christ which is developed in abstraction from what He actually did for men in His life, death, and resurrection is but a formal and delusive play of words. Luther does not like the apocryphal stories of Jesus' youth with their display of superhuman and esoteric powers. "He ate, drank, slept and walked; was weary, sad, joyous; wept, laughed; was hungry, thirsty, cold; sweated, talked, worked, prayed."²² We are undone if we cannot say, "This Man is God." There is a devotion to the Person of Christ, here, similar to that which we find in St. Bernard. Yet, St. Athanasius could not speak more plainly than Luther as to the centrality of the Godhead of Christ.²³ If it could not be held that God died for us, but only a man, then we are lost," said Luther.²⁴ It is significant that Luther charged Zwingli with Nestorianism, because of his conception of "Alloiosis," according to which it is only by a figure of speech that we can assert an interchange of qualities between the natures, the manhood and the Godhead thus ultimately being kept apart.

Zwingli hesitated to draw God too deeply into the human situation while, for Luther, God's complete involvement in the human situation was the only source of hope. Luther fused the human and the divine together with a kind of passion. Harnack says, "Since Cyril, no teacher has arisen in the Church to whom the mystery of the unity of the two Natures in Christ was so deep a consolation."²⁵ We are saved through a soul-union with Christ, so personal and vital, that our sin becomes His and His righteousness ours. The mood of this type of thought again suggests Irenaeus and even Ignatius.

Principal Dykes says that the Christology of the schools

21 Mackintosh, H. R., *The Doctrine of the Person of Jesus Christ* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1912), p. 231.

22 *Loc. cit.*

23 *Ibid.*, p. 233.

24 *Loc. cit.*

25 Harnack, A., *Dogmengeschichte*, I te. Aufl., Vol. III, p. 695, quoted from H. R. Mackintosh, *op. cit.*, p. 234.

tended to hold the two natures apart, so that the Incarnation became a mere clothing of impassable Deity with a garment of mortal flesh.²⁶ It does not seem entirely inconceivable that the doctrine of transubstantiation is related to this incipient docetism, for, according to this doctrine, the divine displaces the natural, the natural remaining only in appearance. In docetic thought as with the doctrine of transubstantiation, the natural is something less than real. For Luther the Incarnation means (1) the attainment by God of that for which He has always longed in His love, namely, humanity as His own form of being and (2) the reception by man of what he was made for, namely, divinity as the very content of his spiritual life.²⁷

This brings us to Luther's conception of time and space, and the best way to catch the mood of Luther's thought here is to contrast it with the thought of a modern thinker who, while bearing striking similarity to Luther at some points, also stands closer to Luther's opponents at others. A definite conception of time and space hovers in the background of every discussion of the Incarnation and the Sacraments. For Karl Barth, as apparently for Zwingli, there are three kinds of time, pre-temporal where Christ is with us in expectation, co-temporal when Christ is with us in the flesh, and post-temporal when Christ is with us in retrospection. For Barth, strictly speaking, the co-temporal Christ was with us only during the forty days after the Resurrection. Before that, i.e., during the earthly life of Christ, the divinity was hidden as under a veil. But in those forty days during which the glorified Christ walked the earth co-temporal with us, we may properly say time stood still, and heaven invaded earth. After the Ascension, Christ is with us in retrospection or in the hope of a second coming.²⁸ Now, this view of time and space is what gave Reformed thought so much resemblance to that of the Old Testament. For both, Christ is absent, and the difference is between Christ-in-expectation and Christ-in-retrospection. Now, for Luther, there

26 Dykes, "Expository Times," December, 1905, p. 105, quoted from H. R. Mackintosh, *op. cit.*, *loc. cit.*

27 Mackintosh, *op. cit.*, *loc. cit.*

28 Barth, K., *Dogmatik*, The Incarnation, para. 14.

was the pre-temporal Christ as in the Old Testament. Likewise for Luther there was the co-temporal Christ, but he would enlarge the duration of co-temporality to include all of Christ's earthly life. Further, he, like Barth and the early Reformed theologians, believed in the Ascension, and yet there is a great difference—he would not think of Christ as being spatially or spiritually remote or inaccessible even after the Ascension. Christ has promised to be with us, not just in recollection but in his glorified flesh. Faith in Christ nullifies post-temporality. It seemed necessary to Luther that Christ should not be far off in time or in space. The God-Man still invades time and space, and He works, not in invisible ways, but through the audible Word and the Sacraments. The closest the Reformed thinkers can come to a doctrine of the real presence is one in which the believer mounts in faith up to the throne of God. For Luther, Christ is bound by His word to come to man, “as oft as we do this in remembrance of Him.” It was essential to Luther that Christ should continually come to men in the most concrete way. Luther's apprehension of man's sin and God's love forced him to resist any conception of the incarnate God that would make Him inaccessible or remote in time or in space.

Finally, among the things that contributed to Luther's high evaluation of the Sacraments was his spiritual affinity with passion-mysticism and his deep appreciation of the depths of spiritual mystery. Luther's relation to mysticism is variously evaluated. Without going into the subject fully, we may note Luther's appreciation of Tauler and his frequent references to St. Bernard, Hugo of St. Victor, and Bonaventura as teachers capable of testifying in matters touching the inner life. In the preface to the edition of the *German Theology*, published in 1518, Luther said that, next to the Bible and St. Augustine, no other book had fallen under his notice from which he had learned more as to the real nature of God, Christ, man and all things.²⁹ Luther is linked with the passion mystics in his intense concentration of attention upon the cross and the Atonement. This concentration upon the cruci-

29 *Erl. Ed.*, LXIII, 238 sq.; *Briefe*, I, p. 46; *K.L.*, p. 136 f.

fixion among the mystics tended to narrow their view of the Atonement, for side by side with this tremendous reality, it was difficult for less central historical events to find a place. Such was not the case with Luther, for with him, the contemplation of the sufferings of Christ was superseded by a trustful acceptance of God's gracious forgiveness achieved through the cross.³⁰ Nevertheless Luther is close to the passion mystics in that he, with them, sees the passion of Christ as the sacrifice of His body and blood for the forgiveness of sins. Luther brings his eucharistic thought into organic relation to forgiveness and the Atonement. Closely connected to this is Luther's appreciation of the mystery and wonder of God's love revealed in His sacrifice upon the cross and in His divine goodness in coming to us in the real presence. This element of awe and mystery must have had much to do with the tremendous impression which his first celebration of the Eucharist had upon him. There is no reason to believe that Luther ever felt much differently about the fundamental mystery in which God gives Himself in true flesh and blood. Luther disliked the word "transubstantiation" and even "consubstantiation" as well as the rationalistic doubts of Zwingli, because they purport to penetrate the mystery of the Sacrament. Even his own rather difficult doctrine of ubiquity was an attempt to rescue religious truth from rationalistic mythology.

Thus we have seen that in his doctrines of Creation, Incarnation, time and space, and in his passion-mysticism, Luther finds a very concrete and vivid sacramentalism congenial. From the creation he deduces the goodness and worthiness of the bread and wine; from the doctrine of the Incarnation he deduces the congenial union of the natural and the supernatural; in his doctrine of time and space he presents divine love as unlimited, constantly self-sacrificing and passing freely from eternity into time; his passion-mysticism gives a central place to Christ's giving of His body and blood for the remission of sins. In passing, it has been implied that Luther's whole personality demanded and embraced the practical and the concrete. Further evidence of the consistency

30 Brilioth, *op. cit.*, p. 135.

of this general attitude could be cited in Luther's appreciation of the arts, pictorial and musical, his tenacity in conserving certain religious ceremonials and rites; and finally Luther's own devotional life.

All in all it must be seen that Luther's doctrine of the Holy Eucharist was not simply a weak and unhealthy shoot growing out of the rot of a dying root and stealing its nourishment from a vigorous young tree beside it. On the contrary, Luther's eucharistic thought is one of the main branches of a towering tree, and as such, it is nourished by the same roots and aspires to the same celestial heights as the other corollaries of the one doctrine of God-with-us. If there are survivals of Medievalism in his thought, they serve to show how truly Luther spoke when he said that he came not to create new truth but to rescue the eternal truth from error.

Thus we have surveyed some of Luther's fundamental pre-suppositions and have found that they contribute to an objectivity and concreteness that should lend itself readily to the appreciation of sacramental means. Luther's extreme loyalty to the Sacraments can hardly be explained in any way other than in relation to his deepest insights. This helps us to a better understanding of Luther's work. His was not a revolt against the sacramental idea in general or against the Holy Eucharist, in particular. Luther was sincere when he said that he had more reverence for the Sacrament than did the Romanists. Luther took the doctrine of the Holy Eucharist seriously, and for this reason, he could not help but come into conflict with Rome. It is not often noted that one of the chief complaints of Luther was neglect of the Sacrament. Another complaint was misuse of the Sacrament. An erroneous conception of the religious life of the Middle Ages has given many students in our own day the impression that all the people did was attend masses and receive Communion and engage in religious processions. Where this conception is held, Luther is presented as the father of a liberty-loving rationalism that freed men from any desire to receive the Sacrament often. The present day Roman Catholic emphasis upon the Eucharist is thus seen as the thing against which Luther rebelled. To see the situation in this light, is

to be unaware of the real facts. No wonder many Protestants who have come to believe that Luther's reform was a revolt against the Sacraments, cannot understand why Luther should finally come to place so much emphasis upon the fine points of sacramental doctrine. The fact is that during the Middle Ages the Holy Eucharist fell more and more into disuse. Roman Catholic historians admit that even among the faithful communion became very infrequent.³¹ The sacrament of penance with its appeal to crusades, pilgrimages, and religious activism made the Holy Eucharist a mere adjunct. The actual sacramental use of the elements had less appeal than all of the various and colorful practices that grew up involving an almost magical use of the host. In Cluniac churches, the corporal was kept as a defense against fire.³² The prince of Scholastic theologians himself composed the ritual for Corpus Christi processions in 1264. In nunneries the cult of the reserved Sacrament with its continual real presence, took the emphasis away from the drama of the liturgy.³³ Even in the mass, itself, the idea of the performance of a sacrifice was pushing the idea of communion into the background. The idea of a communion fellowship was lost in an extreme emphasis on the action of the priest and a consistent and thorough neglect of the presence of the congregation. The writings of Thomas a Kempis, unquestionably a fine expression of eucharistic piety, show a peculiar tendency to emphasize chiefly the devotion of the individual, and especially of the celebrant himself, as if it were considered normal to celebrate the Eucharist as a private devotion.³⁴

The idea of privately said masses came to be associated with the saying of mass for a purpose other than that of commemoration and communion. In the Gelasion Sacramentary there are masses for rain, fair weather, against unrighteous judges, and against slander. In Gregory and Bede there are tales of the release

31 Funck, F. X., *A Manual of Church History*, tr. Luigi Cappadelta, Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner and Co.

32 Brilioth, *op. cit.*, p. 88.

33 *Loc. cit.*

34 Kempis, Thomas, *Imitation of Christ* (London: Humphery Milford, 1917), pp. 251-254, 267-274, 281.

of prisoners on account of masses said for them. The Synod of Toledo in 694 had to condemn a mass said in order to bring about a death.³⁵ A mass said on Monday could secure a prolongation of the Sabbath rest for souls in purgatory.³⁶ This progressive paganizing of the Holy Eucharist became a most awful abomination, especially when financial considerations became involved. Finally, the mathematics of the indulgence undercut even this remnant of the sacramental system. In the commercial competition between the sacrament of penance and the sacrament of the Eucharist, the Eucharist lost, just as it had lost the field of dramatic ritual to Corpus Christi processions and mystical rites of benediction.

This is the background against which Luther's eucharistic reform is to be viewed. He was not struggling against the bondage of the Eucharist; he desired, above all, to rescue the Eucharist, first, from disuse and, secondly, from misuse. The Holy Eucharist had been carried into the captivity of a crass utilitarianism, and an incredible commercialism. His profound love for the Sacrament brought him into conflict with Rome. To understand this, is to have become properly oriented to Luther's conception of reform in general and to have laid the foundation for an understanding of Luther's doctrine of the Eucharist, in particular. In his eucharistic reform, Luther fought a battle against forces of commercialism, secularism, paganism, and crude religious utilitarianism. It was a reform and not a revolt. In Luther's mind it was a battle of the Holy Catholic Church against an ignorant and perverse Roman defection from the historic faith.

35 Brilioth, *op. cit.*, p. 84.

36 *Ibid.*, p. 85.

The Pre-theological Curriculum

MARTIN HEINECKEN

BEFORE the training of men for the ministry can be profitably discussed there must be clarity about the function of the minister. The minister is a servant. In St. Paul's phrase he is a "steward of the mysteries of God." His prime responsibility is to be faithful in the stewardship of these mysteries. He stands in a line of succession, not indeed by birth, nor merely by the laying on of hands, as though this outward act were itself decisive. Yet he is what he is by an act of divine anointing, which is the cause of his courage as well as of his authority, as St. Paul writes to Timothy:

Stir up the gift that is within thee by the laying on of hands, for God has not given us the spirit of fear, but of power, and of love, and of a sound mind. Be not thou, therefore, ashamed of the testimony of our Lord, nor of me his prisoner; but be thou partaker of the afflictions of the Gospel according to the power of God: who hath saved us and called us with a holy calling, not according to our works, but according to his purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began, but is now made manifest by the appearing of our Saviour Jesus Christ, who hath abolished death, and hath brought life and immortality to light through the Gospel (II Timothy 1:6-10).

It is thus that the minister stands in a line of succession, because there has been entrusted to him that gospel of the Savior which it is his duty and constraint to pass on to others. If the analogy is not too trivial and if its onesidedness is realized, it is something like the game the children and the psychologists play when they pass along a whispered word from ear to ear in order to see how garbled it invariably becomes in its passage. As the minister stands in the line it is his business first of all to listen carefully to the Word spoken to him out of the past, so that he will not receive it in a garbled form. Then, as he turns to speak it to the next generation, he is not to make corrections to suit him-

self, but he must pass on what he has heard so clearly and distinctly that there can be no mistaking what he is saying. If this requires a re-translation into the language of his generation then that is not to effect the content of his message. This is the only true apostolic succession.

This, of course, is only an analogy and its weakness must be realized. It is not only a word out of the past to which the minister listens. The Word is the living Lord present in his congregation. The word of the past, which is always the same word, must become alive in each today. The Holy Spirit, the spirit proceeding from the Father and the Son, always enlightens and sanctifies the Church. This is not an independent activity of the Spirit. The Spirit is bound to the means of grace, the Word as message and the Word in action. This is not to forget the final authoritativeness of the canonical written Word.

This should make it clear that it is impossible to become a minister simply through a process of education as the development of innate capacities. It is thus that poets, philosophers, and scientists develop through an innate gift of genius, but unless there is now also proclaimed to such men that Gospel, which came into the world at a definite time and place and from there was carried from Jerusalem through Judea and Samaria and to the uttermost parts of the earth through the faithful transmission of those affected and transformed by it, these men will not ever come to true self-realization; they will not realize the purpose for which they were created;¹ they will, therefore, not be competent guides in the ultimate affairs of men, but only blind leaders of the blind.

It is part of the fateful illusion of our time that it looks to the poet qua poet, to the philosopher qua philosopher, to the scientist qua scientist for ultimate answers to the meaning of existence and the way to true self-realization. It is part of the same fateful illusion that it then looks to the minister—if it looks at all—as able to speak competently and authoritatively only in so far as he is poetic or philosophic or scientific. Christianity must have its poetic or

1 The true self-realization of the Christian is to be understood in the sense of the constant becoming of what in the new creation he is.

philosophic or scientific respectability and get its authority from its beauty or its rationality or its conformity to scientific method. Instead of sitting in judgment, with their unique message of judgment and grace, on the poet, the philosopher and the scientist, along with all other men, the theologians and hence also the ministers continue to make lick-spittle obeisance to them. Then when the ministers have neither poetic, nor philosophic, nor scientific competence, it is no wonder they get no hearing. This is not to suggest that the minister should not by all means recognize the genius and the accomplishments of poets, philosophers, and scientists. Nor does it mean to suggest that the minister should not have the necessary philosophic and scientific competence even where he lacks poetic gifts. No minister is excused from clear reasoning and scientific objectivity. It is precisely by means of clear reasoning and scientific objectivity that he should arrive at a distinction of the categories.

It is a matter of keeping the categories distinct. The Gospel is not to be recommended for its aesthetic appeal. Alongside of the tradition which says that Jesus was a comely man, there is the other which makes him the counterpart of Socrates, whom no one was apt to follow because of his physical beauty. Certainly there is nothing beautiful about the man of sorrows as he stands before Pontius Pilate or as he hangs lacerated upon the cross. It is understandable that there is today a revival of interest in Gruenewald's Crucifixion by way of reaction to Sallman's picture of Jesus. One sometimes gets a real longing for an ugly, malformed crucifix to replace the shining, symbolic crosses that have come to adorn our altars and the necks of our women today. Nor is the Gospel to be recommended as the cornerstone of a structure of thought from which all that could possibly reflect the contradictions of responsible existence has been carefully eliminated. Nor is it to be put on a par with the hypotheses of the scientist carefully established by experimental methods. The Gospel with its unique categories of sin and grace, with its proclamation of a present, living Lord, discernible only to the eyes of faith, belongs in a class by itself. As such it can only be proclaimed.

We will do well to give heed to what St. Paul has to say to the Corinthians about the foolishness of preaching and the foolishness of God which is wiser than the wisdom of men (I Corinthians 2:1) and his words to Timothy, "O Timothy, guard what has been entrusted to you. Avoid the godless chatter and contradictions of what is falsely called knowledge, for by professing it some have missed the mark as regards the faith" (I Timothy 6:20). The minister's authority does not come from his education as such nor can the effectiveness of the ministry be increased *merely* by raising the level of education. Education becomes necessary because of the difficulties of the stewardship. The apostles were not learned men. This must always prove an embarrassment to us. The Bible's literary excellencies are purely incidental and do not add one iota to its authoritativeness. As Kierkegaard says, when the king says, "Go!" and the commoner says "Go!" the words are identical in their unadorned simplicity. What makes the difference is the authority of the king. It is so also with the preacher. How beautifully and effectively he speaks, how graciously he conducts himself in the world's drawing rooms, how adeptly he moves about in the mazes of the world's learning cannot add one iota to the authoritativeness of his message. One cannot, as Kierkegaard says, leap from the fact that the man who is able to say something well is a genius to the conclusion that if something is unusually well said, then God must have said it. To quote Kierkegaard:

To ask whether a king is a genius—with the intention, if such were the case, of obeying him, is in reality a *lèse-majesté*; for the question conceals a doubt as to whether one intends to submit to authority. To be prepared to obey a government department if it can be clever is really to make a fool of it. To honor one's father because he is intelligent is impiety.²

Also, the doctrine communicated to him is not a task which he is given to ponder over, it is not given him for his own sake, he is on the contrary on a mission and has to proclaim the doctrine and use authority. Just as a man sent into the town with a letter has nothing to do with its contents, but has

2 "On the Difference Between an Apostle and a Genius," in *The Present Age* (New York: Oxford Press, 1940), p. 153.

only to deliver it; just as a minister who is sent to a foreign country is not responsible for the content of the message, but has only to convey it correctly: so, too, an apostle has really only to be faithful in his service, and to carry out his task. Therein lies the essence of an apostle's life of self-sacrifice, even if he were never persecuted, and in the fact that he is poor, "yet making many rich," that he never dares take the time or the quiet or carefreeness in order to grow rich. Intellectually speaking he is like a tireless housewife who herself hardly has time to eat so busy is she preparing food for others. . . .³

If all this is granted it should not in the least detract from the necessity of an educated ministry; in fact, it should reveal this necessity as all the more imperative, because of the difficulty of the stewardship. It is in order that he may be a better steward, in order that he may understand his mission more clearly, as well as the world in which and the men to whom he must minister, that the minister must be educated. The limits that are set to this education can only be a matter of expediency, as when in our pioneer period or in the German church today there is no time to be lost before men are sent out to preach the Word and administer the Sacraments to a perishing people. In principle the Church needs the most highly educated ministry. Other things being equal, the more educated the ministry the more effective it will be.

In a little book, *The Gift of Ministry*, which seems to me one of the most significant books on the ministry in recent years, Daniel T. Jenkins speaks of the parson as the representative person of his age. This is by no means to be understood in the sense of typical, as "achieving a safe measure of ordinariness." It means on the one hand that he must enter fully into the life of other men, "sharing the same lot, knowing the same difficulties and doubts and temptations and comforts and hopes." He is by no means to lead a sheltered existence. As Jenkins says,

Life at its grimmest or harshest or most enigmatic should have an almost morbid fascination for him. Wherever there is trouble, he should be found. He is the man among all men who cannot be permitted the luxury of a sheltered life. Nothing indicates more clearly the ministry's betrayal of its func-

3 *Id.*, p. 160.

tion than the growth of the widespread notion that parsons are plants too sensitive to bear the rigors of life in the world as it is and have to be sheltered against the blasts.⁴

But it is not sufficient that the parson just share men's common troubles and doubts. He must also have the solution, and that not merely a verbal one. He himself, in his person, must be that solution. He must be the true person, who realizes responsible existence before God, who has been restored to the image of God in which he was created, and who, nevertheless, lives only in the constant struggle which is the Christian's life-long predicament. He is the man justified by faith, who remains *simul justus et peccator*, but who nevertheless becomes a Christ to his fellowmen. The parson, then, is to be the representative person, who not only understands men in their predicament, but also is a living solution to their problems in being restored to his true nature.

What Jenkins has to say about the education of the minister in England may be applied to our own situation, the necessary changes being made. After the English public school has passed on to the student the values of the society in which he lives, the student assumes at the university a more active task of exploration and criticism. At such a university there is to be complete academic freedom, where every "spermologos" (the babbler of Acts 17) may ply his wares and every heretic have his say, just as long as it is done seriously and scepticism and departure from the traditional are not flippantly made a show of. Such universities are at the present time not Christian and cannot be made Christian overnight. The best that can be hoped for is that the Christian point of view be also given full and free expression and that the theological faculty as one of the faculties of the university properly perform its function of criticism, proclamation, and witness. The theologian must, as Jenkins says, preserve "the right to freedom to carry on his own work on its own true presuppositions, and also to criticize the assumptions of other subjects" (p. 111).

Mr. Jenkins' chief criticism of the universities is their lack

4 Jenkins, D. T., *The Gift of Ministry* (London: Faber and Faber, 1947), p. 66.

of integration and their "donnishness" in the Kierkegaardian sense. Under the guise of scientific objectivity and the pursuit of knowledge for its own sake as the only worthy scholarly pursuit, they have removed their students more and more from the sphere of responsible existence. The crucial-decision character of existence is thus forgotten and the student develops a spectator philosophy. Even Christianity is surveyed with a certain detached, scientific objectivity as one of the interesting phenomena of history, instead of its being heeded as a call to decision. While the student is thus apparently detached in the class room, he nevertheless must live. So it turns out that he is like the man of whom Kierkegaard speaks, who built himself a magnificent castle and then lived in a miserable shack by its side. Outside of the cathedral of the class-room, in the sphere of responsible existence, in which he must willy-nilly live, he makes quite a mess of his life as one of the indistinguishable mass. It is the task, therefore, of the university, instead of removing the student to a realm of scientific objectivity, to set him down, so to speak, into the midst of existence, to teach him self-consciousness, to teach him "what it means to be that individual." In other words, he is to learn what it means to be a center of responsibility over against a sovereign Lord. He is to learn to be isolated from the masses and to see himself strictly as an individual, not only in the sense of the uniqueness witnessed to by the finger-prints, but in the sense of absolute individual responsibility. He must learn what it means to say, "I," and, "I will," and, "I did it with my little hatchet."

After the student has learned in the faculty of arts what it means to be an individual, he is in the faculty of theology to learn self-criticism and the way to true self-realization (p. 123). What specific subjects the student takes before he gets to his studies in theology is not, according to Mr. Jenkins, as important as that he should see them all in the proper relationship. He suggests an intimate study of some particular period of English literature, some philosophy, a knowledge of history, the social sciences, psychology, the classics and a subjection to the discipline of the natural sciences.

How shall this be applied to our pre-theological education situation, if indeed it can be? The American Association of Theological Schools states that the college work of a pre-seminary student should accomplish the following three objectives:

1. Teach him to employ the tools of the educated man.
2. Acquaint him with the world in which he lives.
3. Give him a sense of achievement, which is to be encouraged by concentration in a major field, through "honors" work or other means which will encourage initiative and independent work.

An examination of the catalog statements of both seminaries and colleges of all the Lutheran bodies reveals that, in general, the standards set by the A.A.T.S. are being met, at least on paper. A bachelor of arts degree is required by all the seminaries with the exception of those who have a prescribed six year pre-theological program. It will, I think, be only a question of time until the standards here are also raised. Most seminaries will admit men without a degree if circumstances warrant it and will then grant a certificate of studies, but no seminary will grant a B.D. degree except on the basis of a previous B.A. A B.S. degree is generally acceptable if the other requirements are met. The seminary catalog statements are in most instances in line with the A.A.T.S. recommendations. In a number of instances the statements are not explicit enough to serve as much of a guide to the prospective seminarian.

The situation in the colleges seems much better than in the seminaries so far as explicit conformity to the A.A.T.S. requirements is concerned. Either a definite course is outlined by way of suggestion or else sufficient guidance is promised to insure meeting the A.A.T.S. specifications or those of the particular seminary involved. Outlined courses are suggested only and allow considerable leeway. Catalogue offerings are in the case of all four year colleges sufficient to meet A.A.T.S. recommendations. The tendency is to allow fewer electives than recommended.

This examination reveals that if there are any weaknesses they lie in the area of actual accomplishment rather than in that

of organization. Such weaknesses appear to me to be considerable—sufficient to cause real alarm and to make it necessary for the colleges to reexamine what they are doing. Our attempt to formulate some of them here does not involve any spirit of carping criticism, or lack of awareness of the difficulties involved. Furthermore, they are tempered by the following qualifications. The writer's experience at a seminary is rather limited. It suffers, in addition, from the fact that it was gathered for the most part during the war years, when there was a decline in the calibre of the men and when even the best men were handicapped by the evils of acceleration. Some allowance must also be made for exaggeration for the sake of emphasis. If the writer's experience should not find corroboration from those at other seminaries he will be very happy. These observations are offered for consideration:

1. There is a great deficiency in the handling of the tools of the educated man, especially in the reading, writing, and speaking of the English language, but also in the processes of thinking and the application of the scientific method. This includes poor study habits, an incapacity for sustained effort, ignorance of how to use a library and to gather material independently. A great many are apparently used to doing little more than attending classes and working out piecemeal, day-to-day assignments. They do not read, either in the field of immediate concern or in more general areas. They do not approach a subject with eagerness to read widely and to get a comprehensive grasp as might be expected on a graduate level. They seem to want just to be given answers, neatly packaged in cellophane, all ready for distribution.

If it is true that the ability to think clearly cannot really be taught, that while a tool of good material can be sharpened, not much can be done with inferior material, the present situation would indicate the necessity for greater selectivity. At any rate it is distressing to think that men who have come through four years of college still have so little capacity for and interest in study. One might think that they were going into a profession in which they were not going to look at another book. Perhaps this

is actually the case. To be sure, "book larnin' " isn't going to save the world, and neither are all ministers expected to be scholars. Nevertheless, the ministry is one of the learned professions and every minister is expected to be a student.

2. There is insufficient language preparation. The ordinary two-year college language requirement is quite inadequate to be serviceable in the pursuit of theological studies. Even the language majors cannot read theological literature with any real profit. In view of the army's experience in teaching languages during the war, it would seem that more could be accomplished with language majors than is now being done. In any case it is a fact that we are not getting students who can carry on theological studies in a foreign language. As Lutherans we cannot afford to lose first-hand contact with German and Scandinavian theology. Colleges ought also to reexamine the value of the two-year language requirement.

What of Greek as a requirement? The practice of seminaries differs. In my opinion it is wise to require some Greek of all students—enough so that they can use commentaries profitably. It would be better if they had this preparation before they came to the seminary.

3. There is insufficient mastery in the field of major concentration. Ordinarily one has difficulty determining what a man's major in college was, unless the records are consulted or the student himself makes a shame-faced confession. The choice of majors should follow the student's interests and capacities. Only a select number would seem capable of a major in philosophy. To advise all pre-theologians to major in philosophy seems very unwise—in fact disastrous.

4. There is absence of the proper critical attitude, and evidence of having lived too sheltered an existence. Too many are not interested at all in what others think. As already stated, all they seem to want is a box of pre-fabricated nostrums which they can go out and dispense. Perhaps it is true that they have done their questing and are anxious now for some answers that they have been unable to find. But this is no reason why they should lose

the eager, questioning mind. There is not too much evidence, either, that they have ever come into contact with the problems of men, either directly in every day life or vicariously through reading.

5. The most serious criticism is that so many men either have no integrated world view whatsoever or else hold to views which, strictly speaking, are not Christian. At any rate, whether they espouse it or not, they have no clear awareness of the distinctiveness and uniqueness of the Christian world view.

These men seem to fall into three classes. Those in the first group admit frankly that they are completely at sea. They don't know what it is all about and they say so. Those in the second group possess a vague religiosity that does not deserve to be identified with Christianity. It is what Kierkegaard calls the universally humane religiosity, a sort of synthetic religion, which means to include all that is best from the great thinkers of the world, Jesus being the greatest thinker of them all, who supplements the others. Even if the divinity of Jesus is allowed and he is extolled and worshipped as the only hope of the world, he still remains only a teacher in the Socratic sense by the following of whose teaching the world will be saved from chaos and man will find the satisfaction of his religious needs or drives. The orientation remains intellectual rather than existential. Eternal truths and principles are made known. The objective events, past and present, are not discerned. If it is not this religiosity, then it is for the third group, a smug orthodoxy that is impatient of all but the familiar shibboleths and reduces Christianity to the acceptance of a set of doctrines.

Where does the trouble lie? Perhaps we are working with inferior materials. This would require greater selectivity at the college level. There is a great deal to be said for the so-called "dumb-bell" college to which men go for a general education without any illusions about entering one of the learned professions. If there were this kind of a distinction on the college level, the seminaries would get better material. Then the Church ought somehow also to provide more opportunities for full-time service

in the Church which would not require a full theological training. It probably is not wise on the seminary level to have two types of schools, one for the practical, the other for the scholarly. This is an altogether false distinction. Yet each seminary will in some way have to distinguish between those who are not scholars but will make able ministers, and those fitted for more scholarly work.

What of the confused spiritual state of the men who come to us? Is it the product of the proclamation from the pulpit and the type of religiosity sponsored in the churches? Does it originate in the departments of philosophy and religion in the church colleges? Is it the result simply of the spirit of the age which permeates in spite of constructive efforts to offset it? Wherever the fault may lie, it is necessary for all to take stock.

The following suggestions are ventured to supplement the recommendations of the A.A.T.S. In his pre-theological training, opportunity should be given the student to enter as fully as possible into the varied intellectual life of men, to subject himself to the discipline of doubt, to explore the views opposed to the Christian world view. At the same time there should be constantly presented to him the unique Christian world view, based on the revelation of God, in its clear-cut opposition to man-made hypotheses and systems. In a Christian college this should not only be done in the courses in Christianity and in philosophy, but it should be reflected in every possible course of instruction and in the entire atmosphere of the school.

The present situation in the church schools seems to me to reflect one or the other of the two following emphases: 1. There is no awareness—at least no constructive cultivation—of the unique Christian world view. In place of it there is a sort of the middle-of-the-road, broadminded tolerance, which means to cultivate a Christian character that is a cross between a Y.M.C.A. secretary, a successful business man, a passionate social reformer, a bon vivant, a connoisseur of the arts, a Beau Brummel, a Bernarr Macfadden and a Florence Nightingale. Radical opinions of all kinds are, of course, anathema and it is the typical,

substantial citizen who is the pillar of the community and sure to be on the side of the status quo who is being cultivated. The Christian college is the typical preserver of middle-class morality and there isn't much difference between schools, whether Lutheran, Methodist, or non-denominational. It is a place where in a congenial atmosphere those who are interested in the finer things of life may cultivate them. The discipline of real doubt is never administered. The sharp cleavages of opinion that constitute a strict either-or are blunted into a dull both-and. The typical (?) product of such an institution will, no doubt, be one of the children of light; he will manifest universally human religiosity, but he will have no understanding of the pathos and the joy of the Christian world view.

2. There is a one-sided indoctrination of what is regarded as the Christian view on all matters, without ever letting contrary opinions be given a respectable and sympathetic hearing. All questioning is condemned and stifled. The product of such a school is dogmatic, intolerant, cock-sure, ignorant of other points of view. He may be right, but he is right in the wrong way and so makes himself ineffectual.

The foregoing are admittedly caricatures. Probably no single school could be said to represent the one type or the other without considerable qualification. Yet the descriptions do represent tendencies and as such may be of service in self-criticism.

Is it not possible then, for the Christian college to confront men existentially with conflicting world views? These views should not just be surveyed in objective, spectator fashion, but they should actually be wrestled with in all honesty. The student is not just to be sheltered and indoctrinated, but he is actually to cope with the problems of life, but always in such a way that the Christian solution is also there, as an all-permeating, persuasive, saving leaven. It should not be impossible to have a staff of teachers at a Christian college who know alternative world views and yet themselves are Christians. Is there any justification for employing at a Christian college a single teacher who is unwilling to make a clear, unequivocal Christian confession in word and deed

and who does not consider his position a Christian vocation? How shall it be judged whether or not a teacher is a Christian? In exactly the same way that it is judged whether a person has a right to be considered a member of the Christian church. The church should remember that it is a church for sinners and not for holier-than-thou's, and yet the church must demand an open confession and a certain manner of life. Shall the Christian college do any less? There are other justifications for the small church-related college, but the chief one must forever be that here the distinctly Christian world-view is understood and fostered so as to create real community. If this program were ideally carried out then perhaps theological students would come to the seminary with a better understanding of the Christian world view and of those other views with which it is in conflict.

The church college is, however, by no means the only institution in which pre-theologians are trained and it is good that it is so. Men from non-church schools are often much better prepared than those from the church schools. The church should be making and actually is making its influence felt on the non-church school campus, not only by student service work but by the influence of Christian teachers on its faculties. The church school has its sufficient justification, but it will not help its cause by simply berating the godless influence of other schools. Its approach must be positive and constructive.

Whatever may be the difficulties that lie in the way, the objectives of all Christian nurture are clear, to make men aware, first of all, of what responsible existence as an individual in God's presence means, to subject them to proper self-criticism in the light of the Word of revelation and then to lead them to true self-realization through faith, never forgetting that this is the Holy Spirit's work in his own day and hour. These objectives, in addition to the more specifically technical ones, certainly ought to be kept in mind by all those interested in pre-theological as well as all Christian education.

There is much pessimism in our day. There are the Jeremiahs and Cassandras who believe that what has happened in

Europe is inevitable here. It looks as though they might be right, but there is still hope in a chastened and awakened church and in a consecrated ministry to the building of which we are all dedicated.

It is not the business of the Church to save civilization, but in properly proclaiming its message it is just possible that it might nevertheless save some of it. Here also Jesus' words apply, "Seek ye first the kingdom of God and his righteousness, and all these things shall be added unto you."

Notes and Studies

GRUNDTVIG AND KIERKEGAARD

M. G. CHRISTENSEN

The two men under consideration were quite different; in fact they can be likened to opposite poles. As we look at one in contrast to the other, we not only become aware of a certain one-sidedness, but we note that each of them—a unique and powerful structure in himself—points to the other as a supplement. Both of them signify a new break-through of intellectual and spiritual life in Denmark, which, without any exaggeration whatsoever, was the greatest original contribution to spiritual life in Denmark in the nineteenth century. Their names are now gradually becoming known in most countries outside of Denmark.

A story is told about Grundtvig and Kierkegaard that they were once seen walking together on Ostergade in Copenhagen. Grundtvig was walking along, broad and quiet as usual. Kierkegaard, on the other hand, moved in an agitated and restless way, now on one side of his companion and now on the other, and carrying on a lively discussion all the while. About Kierkegaard it is said that it was an impossibility ever to walk straight down the street with him; he would either crowd you over against the houses or into the gutter. When the two parted, Grundtvig just barely touched his hat in saying goodbye, but Kierkegaard made a deep bow, respectfully removing his hat.

Outwardly, their lives were quite different. Grundtvig was born in 1783; he died in 1872, almost eighty-nine years old. Kierkegaard was only forty-five years old when he died in October, 1855. In spite of serious sicknesses, at times so serious that they almost broke him inwardly and mentally, Grundtvig retained robust health. He married three times (twice as a widower), and

when he was seventy-seven years old he became the father of a daughter.

Kierkegaard's experience offers quite a contrast. As a boy he was slender and frail. He never took part in the games of his playmates. He never defended himself with his fists, but with a sharp tongue and barbed wit. His ability to vex and to "get the laugh" on others was both hated and feared.

And Kierkegaard never married. He was once engaged, but regretted what he had done the following day and broke the engagement. He did not think that a wife would be able to help him; he was a thousand years, yes, an eternity too old for her. Kierkegaard had never experienced what it meant to be a child, or to be young, for he had been brought up as if he were an old man.

Grundtvig represents a strong and courageous optimism, an optimism which fights for what is right and which is able to celebrate the beauty of life in song. When Grundtvig fought it was as though he used the broadsword, swinging it in wide circles. Kierkegaard's keen thinking was more like a rapier which, swift as lightning, gleams in the air and finds its mark. In polemics Grundtvig's pen was as broad as Kierkegaard's was pointed. Grundtvig's style could be heavy and prolix; with his many repetitions he is often tiresome and tedious. Kierkegaard also used repetitions but knew their dangers and used great care in his choice of words. His style is filled with feeling, and he knows where to put the light and the shadows in the picture he is painting.

Grundtvig's view of Christianity was sunny and cheerful, a view which in Denmark has given occasion to the expression *den glade Kristendom*—supposed to characterize his followers in the so-called Grundtvigian movement. But Kierkegaard was the pessimist. Of course, there was much in his life which contributed toward making him the prophet of gloom and despondency: an austere and strict bringing up, a wounded inner life, a lack of understanding which he imagined he saw in his contemporaries (perhaps real). Together with these things he struggled with a sick mind, he was possessed with an unhealthy tendency for self-analysis, and he was inclined to fondle sadness, sorrow, and pain.

He says of himself, "besides a rather large circle of acquaintances and associates I have yet one intimate confidante, my melancholy. In the midst of my joys or my work she waves to me, calls me aside, even if I remain bodily where I am. My melancholy is the most faithful lover I have known; no wonder that I love her in return." In the very last period of his life he screamed the supposed result of his life into the world with a pathos and force unequalled since the days of the French revolution.

As Kierkegaard's voice cut out sharply through things, Grundtvig's voice often seemed to come from the deep, the dark, the still. In his later years not a few of Grundtvig's followers complained that he was difficult to understand. Kierkegaard compared Grundtvig with a bass voice which goes down so deep that at last you cannot hear a thing. "The profundities of Grundtvig," he declares, "are so deep, that if you listen closely you really do not hear a thing."

Grundtvig has been called *Livsmodets Profet* (*Lebensmut*). Kierkegaard on the other hand is the spokesman of asceticism. He gradually came to regard woman as a mendacious being, who can only pull man downward, and he spoke of the propagation of the race as a calamity.

Grundtvig is also referred to as a prophet of freedom. After the Danish constitution had been adopted in 1848, Grundtvig championed the idea that a people has the sacred right to determine its own affairs. Kierkegaard on the other hand was entirely untouched by the liberal movements of his day. He seemed to fear that the people through a national uprising might lose all their religion. He began by championing authority; he ended as its destroyer. Throughout his life he was the great individualist (*den store Ener*). This was his wish, and it was not denied him. His life and what moved within him he shared with no stranger; his person was an enigma; his homelife an unknown world. From his youth he only had one friend, Emil Boeson, pastor in Horsens, Jutland. Boeson was the only man who was with Kierkegaard at his deathbed. Kierkegaard left this greeting with Boeson: "Greet all men. I have loved them all. Tell them that my life has been one

great, to others unknown and incomprehensible suffering. All of it appeared to be pride and vanity, but this was not the case. I am no better than the rest. This is what I have said, and never have I said anything else." When Boesen asked Kierkegaard if he believed in and took his refuge in the grace of God, he answered "Yes, of course, what else!"

Grundtvig was a poet, one of the greatest. It is a question whether any other country has anything comparable to his *Sangvaerk til den Danske Kirke*. But Kierkegaard never wrote a line of poetry; and yet, in his prose he is the poet, and a lover and admirer of language.

They are equally contrasting figures in the areas of temperament and talent. The bent of mind in each was something unique and something for itself. Where one of them was full of sparks like a hot piece of iron, the other burned more like a quiet flame.

This difference is probably best seen in their attitude toward men and history. Kierkegaard always wants to get hold of the individual. The individual must, at any cost, be separated from the whole, the masses, who rob him of his sense of responsibility; he must be placed on a pedestal. Kierkegaard is deeply interested in this individual, he examines his soul-life (as well as his own) in the minutest detail.

Not so Grundtvig, who showed little interest in the individual; nor did he seem to have any great understanding of him. He looked out over the nations, and as he knew them, he gave to each nation its place and its task in world history. He did not have the ability to take a cross section of the individual but rather a longitudinal section of the whole.

This Kierkegaard could not do. In reality he was un- or a-historical; he had no sense for history's peculiarity (*Eigenart*), neither as poetry nor as a science. If history comes to life in his pen, it is imagined history, his own construction and out of his own soul-life. Where Grundtvig busies himself with the nations, their past and present, Kierkegaard takes the individual aside in order to make him reflect over his own life, his responsibility before God, and his own minuteness measured with the yardstick

of eternity. Where Grundtvig views milleniums and is moved by mighty visions, Kierkegaard emphasizes the moment (*Ojeblikket*), that moment when time and eternity meet, and God and man find one another, because then the moment ceases to be a period of time in the ordinary sense of the word and takes on significance for eternity (*Evighedsbetydning*) in the individual. Where Grundtvig writes poetry out of and about the congregation, out of and about Christian fellowship here on earth, Kierkegaard takes the individual into a small boat and lets him sail out onto the 70,000 fathoms of the deep.

One hundred years ago Copenhagen was only a small city. In this community they had a chance to meet now and then, on the street or elsewhere. And they became acquainted with one another's ideas and thought because they were both men who used the pen. What did they think of each other?

Grundtvig's observations about Kierkegaard are not very original. They do furnish, however, something of a commentary to the statement that Grundtvig did not interest himself very much in the individual, or spend much time analyzing the individual. Kierkegaard's gifts and powers as one of the keenest intellects and thinkers of all time Grundtvig neither understood nor evaluated. Kierkegaard's dialectic dexterity appeared to him to be nothing more than hair-splitting. Kierkegaard's last attack against "the official church" (especially against Bishop Mynster) Grundtvig took up for discussion in one of his sermons (for the 4th Sunday in Advent, 1854—6 days after Kierkegaard had published his article *Var Bishop Mynster et Sandhedsvidner, et af de rette Sandhedsvidnere, er dette Sandhed in Faedrelandet*, December 18, 1854). That this whole thing would end in *terrorem* seemed clear to him. The above-mentioned Emil Boesen tells in one of his letters that Grundtvig is supposed to have said "Kierkegaard is a blasphemer . . . and all swear to that."

Kierkegaard's observations and estimates of Grundtvig are much keener. The Grundtvigian view on the Apostles' Creed—that this creed is the word of the Lord Himself and thus the foundation of the congregation (*Menigheden*), the touchstone as

to what is true Christianity—Kierkegaard regarded as a good pillow to go to sleep on. Grundtvig had the congregation as well as the individual moored to the Creed. But it was necessary that Kierkegaard *not* be moored. Whether the Creed was a word of the Lord Himself or not was an open question, a question that could only be settled through historical research; and as such research never does reach a final conclusion, it is too insecure to let your faith rest on it.

In his book *Afsluttende uvidenskabelig Efterskrift til de filosofiske Smuler* (Unscientific Postscript), written in 1846, Kierkegaard gave Grundtvig's theory a comprehensive and critical treatment. But as early as 1835 he writes in his diary about it, pointing out its inconsistency.

Nor did Kierkegaard like to see Grundtvig, who was supposed to represent the "oldtime religion," take such an active part in the nationalistic movement of his day which to him was little more than nonsense.

One more thing must be mentioned. Grundtvig had his misgivings about the state church of Denmark, and he had continually threatened to withdraw from it, but he never did. Kierkegaard thought Grundtvig to be afflicted with the evil which he calls "both—and"; he charged him with wanting to be an apostle but at the same time wanting to be at ease in one of the most comfortable positions within the state church. He writes: "For 40 years Grundtvig has been considering withdrawal from the state church. It is possible that he has the peculiarity in him to get to be 2 or 300 years old which would tally with the 40 years time he has had to consider such a step." In this statement of Kierkegaard we may sense a bitter feeling toward Grundtvig. It stems from the last period of his life and was intended as a parallel to his attack on Mynster.

In conclusion we should not forget that both of these men had their home within the same church, were serving the same Lord, and both will have something to say to every individual in every generation.

THE CHURCH IN COMMUNIST CHINA

A significant report appears in the May-June *China News-Letter*, issued by the Lutheran World Federation, from Kowloon Hongkong. Its bearing on the missionary situation in China can readily be seen. The report is signed by A. S. O., the initials of the Rev. Arthur S. Olson, the China Director of the LWF.

"Last fall a 'Fang Wen T'uan' or Visiting Team from Shanghai, consisting of five men, visited several cities in Central China. The purpose of this team was to serve as a liaison committee between the Government and the churches. The five men were Dr. Wu Yao-tsung and Mr. Liu Liang-mo, who had been among the delegates to the People's Political Consultative Conference which met in Peking a year ago; Dr. George Wu, general secretary of the National Christian Council; Prof. Tu Yu-chin, general secretary of the Y.M.C.A., and a former professor at St. John's University in Shanghai; and Rev. Ai Nien-san of the Augustana Lutheran Mission, now pastor of the Chinese Lutheran Church in Shanghai. While Pastor Ai was a member of this Visiting Team, he was not acting in the capacity of representing the Lutheran Church in China. The Lutheran Church of China, which is not affiliated with the National Christian Council, was not asked to be represented nor did it seek such representation. Pastor Ai was merely asked by individuals in Shanghai to join the team.

"The outcome of these meetings with the Government authorities and church leaders was that at each big center visited, five men representing the government and five representing the churches were appointed to form a committee to discuss and decide on such church problems as would need clarification.

"In May of this year a similar team was sent by the National Christian Council to several cities in North China. While in Peking the Team together with a number of other church leaders met in conferences arranged with Premier Chou En-lai and other government officials. Since the results of these conferences may have far reaching effects upon the future of the Christian work in China I am sure the readers of our News Letter will be keenly

interested in reading this report. The following translation which was first given in Chinese can be considered authentic.

“Digest of letter to all Christian leaders in China from some Christian leaders who met with Premier Chou En-lai and Peking Government representatives in Peking on May 2, 6, and 13th.’ (The session of Saturday, May 6, continued until four o’clock Sunday morning.)

“‘1. Consultants: Y. T. Wu, YMCA; Liu Liang-mo, YMCA; Cora Teng, YWCA; H. H. Tsui, Church of Christ in China; Bishop Chiang, Peking Methodist; Ai Nien-san, Lutheran; T. C. Chao, Dean of Yenching School of Theology; Y. C. Tu, YMCA; and a group ranging from 30-40 church leaders and government representatives who met with Premier Chou En-lai on the above mentioned dates.

“‘2. Findings: The Church leaders were deeply impressed with the alertness of Premier Chou En-lai, and his sympathetic attitude to the problems of the Church. They highly respect his advice.

“‘The findings of the Conferences were revised three times. It is not probable that there will be any further revisions in the future. So on May 18, 1950, the Findings signed by Y. T. Wu, Liu Liang-mo, H. H. Tsui, Cora Teng, Y. C. Tu, and N. S. Ai were sent to all church groups in China for signatures. It is urged that all Churches signify their adoption of the Findings by writing their approval to Y. T. Wu during the month of June.

“‘3. Problems for Consideration: How shall the Church go forward or The Pathway for the Church in the Future.

- (a) The Church must support the Kung Tung Kang Ling (Common Principles of People’s Political Assembly) promulgated last year.
- (b) The Church must accept the leadership of the Government.
- (c) The Church must work together harmoniously with the Government. In all this the Church must struggle for independence, democracy, peace, unification and prosperity of China.

“‘4. Basic Methods.

“‘(a) Theory 1. The Christian church must use her utmost strength to eradicate all Imperialism. (Erase all imperialistic thoughts.)

“‘2. It must use effective education and propaganda methods to give all the Christians a clear understanding of the part played by American Imperialism, using the Church to cloak these nefarious imperialistic methods.

“‘3. Use the three “Self” principles:—Self-government, Self-support, Self-propagation, thus attaining the goal of revolutionary survival.

“‘4. Avoid the old feudal system and all capitalistic practices.

“‘5. Practice “self-criticism” and act in accordance with this criticism.

“‘6. Educate all Christians to understand these things clearly and to enthusiastically support the Land Division program.

“(b) Practice. 1. As a principle use no foreign personnel. On this point consult with Government officials.

“2. As a principle use no foreign funds. On this Church leaders should consult with Government officials.

“3. Church activities should be confined to routine work, such as: Scheduled services, regular meetings, selecting and training suitable leaders and improving the work. In addition to this there is the important work of opposing the feudal system, capitalism, etc., and pushing forward such work as education of the masses, labor, good literature, and music, the understanding of the present time, medical social service, and the care and raising of children.

“4. The question was asked by the Fang Wen T’uan as to what should be done when any church property is taken for use by the government without church consent. The answer was that the Christian group involved should report the matter to the local officials and they would consider it.’

“This finishes the report, which is being circulated as the Letter from the Leaders to the Churches. A report of the Shanghai Christian Leaders to the Shanghai Church has a slightly different angle, which I think is well worth noting. Summarized it is as follows:

“1. During the Land Reform (Division of Land) the Church is to cease its work. That means that there is to be no work of expansion, and no special evangelistic work. Already in many places in China, Christian work is limited to the scheduled Sunday morning service. Missionaries will not be permitted to come in, for the Government prohibits that.

“2. The future of the Church. The People’s Government does not oppose the Church, though it is admitted that there is a group which would like to have the church non-existent. The government welcomes the good movements in the church, and particularly those who will oppose imperialism, and uphold the government. The Church must become the revolutionary factor to wipe out imperialism. The example of the Russian Church is to be followed.

“3. The missionaries who are law-abiding and not the running dogs of the imperialists may remain in China. But new missionaries may not come in at this time for the Government does not know and cannot guarantee their thinking. The chief example is J. Leighton Stuart, who as founder of Yenching University did wonderful things for China, but he turned and became a running dog of Imperialistic America, by becoming its Ambassador in Nanking.

“4. Funds from the West for the work should be stopped. But funds

for a good cause like schools and hospitals can be accepted, provided the source is known.

"While there is much in the above report that we cannot sanction, we should not become discouraged. There is a multitude of Christians in China who are established in their faith and know in whom they have believed. These will not be moved by any tidal wave of man-made doctrines. Passing through a time of testing and possible persecutions today, they will become the pillars of the church of tomorrow. It is true that many of the Chinese have readily acquiesced in the communist triumph. However, that has always been their way with whatever new rulers have imposed themselves upon them, but they have always rebelled when the new rulers proved unsatisfactory.

"The Chinese Church has been lacking in strong leadership. During the last World War when missionaries were forced to leave, many of the Chinese leaders and Christians did not only remain true to their faith, but realizing their responsibilities, developed leadership and stewardship in no small degree. Have we not a right to predict that the present tidal wave will cleanse the Church of much superficial Christianity and produce strong sturdy Christian leaders?

"While we are apt to lose faith in man let us not lose faith in God or in the power of His Spirit." A. S. O.

A PROPOSAL FOR A LUTHERAN GRADUATE SEMINARY

BERNHARD ERLING

For many years the need for a Lutheran graduate seminary in this country has been stressed. As such a project has been studied it has become evident that such a graduate seminary should be related to an undergraduate student body. This, however, has posed a difficulty, for it would be most ideal if all the seminaries could share equally in instituting this new school.

The following proposal is suggested as a means by which such a student body could be secured without selecting one of the seminaries in preference to all the others. The proposal in brief is that all of the existing seminaries that would cooperate in this program should limit their curriculum to two years, sending their senior students, after perhaps a year of internship, to one common senior seminary. Here the students would spend their final year, and some would remain to carry on further graduate studies. Thus a center for Lutheran graduate theological study in this country would be established.

Such a seminary would be able to make an important contribution to Lutheran unity. It is well known that most of the leaders of the ecumenical movement received their impulse for this wider service during their student days. So also many of the leaders in the present effort to achieve Lutheran unity might trace their broader concern back to fortunate contacts and associations during student days. This seminary would make such contacts and associations possible for all the pastors of the church who would receive their final year of training here.

Furthermore, such a seminary would cultivate a sense of Lutheran unity and strength without sacrificing the particular heritages found in the Lutheran Church of America. Our seminaries represent a variety of traditions transplanted in this country and developing since the periods of immigration. We now realize that we must find a way in which this rich heritage can at the same time be preserved and shared. Indeed it will be possible to preserve our distinctive emphases only if we succeed in sharing them with each other.

The establishment of a senior seminary for the Lutheran Church in America would make it possible for all of the present seminaries to continue to make their important contributions to our program of theological education. At the same time they would be relieved of part of the total responsibility for pastoral training, which is beginning to be a heavy burden for some of the smaller schools.

Setting up such a seminary would require agreement on a common curriculum on the part of the participants. It would seem that the basic courses in all the divisions of theological study should be covered in the first two years. With this common preparation, and possibly a year's experience in parish service, the men should come to the senior seminary for their final preparation.

This would include intensive work in the field of practical theology. Pastoral theology, counseling, and preparation for specialized ministries could be taught by the best men available in the church, using also the resources which a large urban and university center would afford, for no doubt such a site would be chosen for this seminary. Further work could be done in Christian education and homiletics.

The second major emphasis during this final year would be a study of the Lutheran Church in America, its theology, its worship, organization, and present activity. It should be possible to acquaint the student body each year with the leaders of the Church in this country, as well as visiting churchmen from abroad. This setting, which might involve nearness to other denominational schools, would also provide an excellent opportunity to study the relation of the Lutheran Church to the other Churches, making possible the emergence of an ecumenical consciousness.

Finally there should be lectures each year by visiting scholars on the major themes of Christian theology. This aspect of the curriculum could vary with the specialties of the visiting professors. In this connection the students should be stimulated to carry on independent research projects, many of which would be continued during an additional year of graduate study. Here the superior facilities which this common Lutheran seminary could afford would be highly advantageous.

The direction of this academic program should be in the hands of the faculties of the cooperating Lutheran seminaries and the boards to which they are responsible. This theological school would be the creature of these seminaries, designed by them to serve the needs of the whole Church. On the financial side such a seminary could be a project of the National Lutheran

Council. Through this agency the Churches could raise the needed funds for buildings and endowments.

When the merits of this proposal are assessed, it should be remembered that it is designed to meet two needs of the Lutheran Church in America—our needs for a center of graduate theological study, and our need to foster unity among the pastors of the church. Those who do not recognize these two needs may find little reason to consider this proposal. Those who do recognize these needs may be led by it to suggest better ways in which these needs can be taken care of. It is to stimulate such thinking that this proposal for a Lutheran graduate seminary is offered.

Sic Et Non

The Aims and Policy of the *Lutheran Quarterly* include the statement that "differences of opinion between contributors, or between a contributor and the editors, does not of itself exclude articles from publication since the editors do not hold themselves responsible for the opinions of contributors." It is expected that there will be differences of opinion between contributors, and that there will be differences between contributors and readers. Space should be afforded for replies to contributions, provided they be clear, to-the-point, and not too long. As occasion arises, therefore, such replies will be included in these columns, under the above heading. The title we borrow from Abelard who placed side by side opinions of the teachers of the Church which seemed or in reality were contradictory of each other. He himself drew no conclusions from the differing statements but left to the reader to form his own conclusion.—Editor.

CHURCHES-IN-EXILE

Before me lies a copy of the LUTHERAN QUARTERLY¹ which contains an article about Lutheran service to refugees. This service is a work about which a monument of unspeakable gratitude is erected in the hearts of the refugees. But in the same article I found statements which shocked me. Thorns were hidden under the roses. There we read: "It is not an easy matter for Lutheran 'churches in exile' to condemn themselves to extinction, yet this is what must happen." Further the author says to the ministers and the believers in these churches that their old loyalty must be abandoned and turned towards these who evaporate their old churches.

I must confess that these words and other statements were very hard to read. They really took my peace away. And no wonder. This new revelation is of depressive character. Think yourselves: the Russian Communists came and demanded, "Change your old loyalty!" Then the Nazis came and demanded, "Change your old loyalty!" Now in a Christian journal the same melody,

"Change your old loyalty." Because these statements concern very serious things I felt it necessary as a refugee, a Christian, a minister of the Gospel and a teacher of theology, to say a few words.

First, seen from the Christian point of view this advice to abandon the old loyalty is exceedingly unhappy. Of course, such an abandonment and betrayal is very popular today. Whole nations and countries have been abandoned and promises and declarations betrayed. It seems to be that something of this disintegrating spirit has crept even into Christian opinion. But nevertheless, that does not justify us to make from a failure a virtue. Christians cannot go this broad way. They must remain at the old-fashioned conviction, namely: it is a great value to remain faithful wherever God has placed us. Such loyalty and faithfulness is the greatest gift of life and it serves the interest of the whole community. Those who really serve Christ cannot but respect these fellow-Christians who go this serious way. But to preach an abandon-

1 "Lutheran Service to Refugees," January, 1950.

ment of loyalty means to give dangerous advice. Everyone who tries this way must remember that one never knows where it will end.

But the problem is much deeper. There is an unspeakable tragedy in the experience of the Christians in exile; namely, they meet with a lack of real understanding. Only very few reveal any comprehension. The great majority take it for granted that there is nothing to ask from the refugees as to what they feel and what they think. They are simply taken into tutelage by those who always know better what these Christians need now and in the future. But believe me or not, these unhappy Christians still know what are their needs and their duties. Through a miracle we have escaped death and experienced wondrous guidance in our tragedies. Nevertheless we know that we have not deserved our life. We know that there is only one thing which justifies our present life among the free nations: to serve Christ so that we remain faithful in the religious-ethical obligations toward our brethren in despair and in calamity, and toward men everywhere who share the same fate. We are Christian ambassadors of Christian peoples of whom you speak as members of the same body. They are forgotten by many; but we know, they adjure us not to fail. These obligations become more imperative if we take our experiences seriously for Christ's sake. That is the only reason which justifies us to live among free nations in a time when our better companions, innumerable Christians, are in prisons and in mass-graves. This is a holy duty which cannot be declared non-existent by others, and cannot be laid down by ourselves. That is an obligation which does not depend upon the acknowledgment or non-acknowledgment of others.

If this is understood, we do not need any longer many words to explain the justification of the existence of the churches-in-exile. They are not a booty of war, to be distributed; they have a

special mission. First towards their own believers. The churches-in-exile have by their experiences been annealed into a hard and steely consciousness of the nature of the Christian faith and its ethical obligations. The host-churches, furthermore, dare not lay upon the conscience of the exile-churches the abandonment of their unhappy fellow-Christians. These churches feel, with a passion that general Christendom cannot be expected to understand, a powerful moral obligation to continue their special witness in whatever place they may have been led. To fail that witness would in the mind of these churches be an unforgivable repudiation of the task for which God has specially spared them.

Moreover, the exile-churches have a task in the world. These churches have a sense for the *Kairos* which can be of enormous service to the entire Christian community. For the good of its own soul Western Christendom ought to cherish these little churches. These churches may under God have their present function in this,—that they constitute an interpretative perspective from which may be seen with its true face the basic peril of our time.

Thus it becomes clear that the attempt to evaporate these churches will hardly reach their aim. But, of course, these attempts will cause severe damage. Many have already lost contact with the church. And considering the means being used for the extinction of these churches, it is easy to foresee that many will decisively turn their back upon Christianity.

Finally, this above-mentioned statement from the Christian circles should show where Christianity stands. It is terrifying that these words are spoken at a time when we are confronted with a danger never seen before, at a time when a murderous hand is in action against the Church as a whole. If this superficial and irresponsible attitude towards the grave questions of death and life continues,—an attitude to which unfortunately the Protestant church has made its

vital contribution²—it is not impossible at all that the world and the world churches will see a far greater liquidation. Thus, in this gloomy light this above-mentioned statement appears as exceedingly shortsighted.

Our ghastly time and its signs demand a far deeper and more serious insight. Nothing is more urgent than an absolutely new vision as to why we should work today for Christ as never before. Professor Brunner, who is one of the few theologians with a sense for the actual and a prophetic insight says that the need for every Christian force in devotional activity and service of Christ is so urgent, that "we must not strive for a greater uniformity but, on the contrary, for an even greater differentiation."³ This is a true diagnosis by a man who knows what it means to serve Christ. We con-

clude with his further sharp reminder which appears as a breeze of fresh and clean air. Brunner is discussing the brotherly assistance of the Christians in different churches and the mutual readiness to learn from one another, and asserts that all this "is a far more significant manifestation of unity than the struggle after unity of organisation."

ARTHUR VÖÖBUS,
Chicago Lutheran
Theological Seminary
Maywood, Illinois

2 See my essay, "*Communism's Challenge to Christianity* (Maywood, 1950), pp. 73 ff.

3 E. Brunner, "One Holy Catholic Church," *Theology Today* (Princeton, 1947), IV, 324.

Book Reviews and Notices¹

Addressed to Christians: Isolationism vs. World Community. By Floyd H. Ross. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1950. 154 pages. \$2.00.

The author is head of the department of religion at the University of Southern California. He has taught courses in comparative religion and has written on that subject. It is that line of interest that determines his reasoning in this little volume.

Dr. Ross rejects the Christian claim to have a special revelation in Christ and the Bible. Such claims, he says, only antagonize and alienate the people of the non-Christian world and constitute a psychological barrier to a "world community." Christians are admonished to lay aside their dogmatism and develop a "sense of community." Religion should be regarded as "experience of God" rather than adherence to doctrine, and then all men would realize their kinship with one another. Individuals and societies should remain free to choose their own pathway to God and should not be coerced by those who assume that they are the "true Israel" and God's chosen instruments to proclaim the truth.

The seven chapters of the book are chronological in their order. The reader is taken back to the early Church and shown that as the Christian group enlarged, its horizon narrowed, because creeds were developed, heretics were condemned, and thus psychological barriers were erected against outsiders. The Reformers of the sixteenth century were "hesitant" and then swung to theological assumptions about the absoluteness of Christianity which made impossible the concept of community. And the World Council of Churches as constituted at present is equally isolationist and holds

no promise of "world community" unless it lays aside its Christian exclusiveness and becomes a World Parliament of Religions.

The author states his case clearly and consistently and with an attractive style. His argument is never dull, and the publisher is right in calling the book "a highly controversial, fighting book." His main theme is that so long as Christians claim a special revelation and try to bring their kind of salvation to the whole world, they are out of harmony with the goal of One World. Those who disagree with that premise will disagree with the entire book.

ABDEL ROSS WENTZ

Christian Unity in the Making. By Charles S. Macfarland. New York: The Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, 1948. 376 pages. \$2.75.

The story of the first twenty-five years of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America is the story of Dr. Macfarland's leadership and organizing ability. No one else could have told the story in detail as has the writer, for no other person knows it as he does. But just because it is the account of one man's connection with the Council, the book lacks the total objectivity that a history such as this might have. Dr. Macfarland proves the old adage that no one can be perfectly objective in describing his own accomplishments, regardless of how significant they may be.

In spite of this, or because of this, depending upon the point of view, the book

¹ Books reviewed or noticed in these pages may be purchased through your church's publication house.

is important. It will become still more important as the Federal Council gives way to the National Council, for in this volume many of the significant documents pertaining to the Council are printed in full. For the student of the ecumenical movement in America the bibliography is valuable, because the author lists not only those books and pamphlets which pertain to the Federal Council, but he includes all volumes which refer to the Council and its relation to the ecumenical movement.

It must be remembered that *Christian Unity in the Making* is not a history of Christian unity in America, nor is it the total story of the Federal Council. It is the story of 1905 to 1930, and thus the significant events of 1930 to the present are not recounted. One hopes that some day their story in relation to the Council will be told also, for otherwise much valuable material will inevitably be lost.

All the chapters do not have equal significance, for certain events, though burned deeply in Dr. Macfarland's memory, have not much significance in the total picture. Some chapters make thrilling reading, some are fascinating, others are overburdened with insignificant and relatively unimportant details. It is not a book that one picks up for an evening's reading; it is rather the kind of book that one uses for reference, and uses again and again.

Two Lutherans are mentioned: Dr. George V. Wenner, New York, "pioneer prophet" of a plan for weekday religious education, and S. S. Schmucker, whose Evangelical Alliance "was in largest measure the precursor of the Federal Council." Macfarland points out that in both his 1838 and in his 1870 proposals, Schmucker would have accorded a measure of authority to local, state, and national federations which has neither been sought nor realized. But the federal principle has been significant. Without it, the Council could not have developed. In fact, without it, the Council would probably have died an early death. A footnote on page 27 summarizes this: "Not

infrequently during the later history of the Federal Council men who were in a hurry criticized the Council because the Council did not speed up. Finally, in 1920, they took things in their own hands and created the ill-fated Interchurch World Movement, one of the most artificial movements in church history. The men responsible for the Federal Council tested the ground ahead at every step."

In spite of the defects mentioned above, the book is important. Perhaps no one but the then general secretary could have undertaken the task, for no one else so well knew the story as did he. It is biased, to be sure. Even the dullest pages testify to the fervor for church unity in the heart and mind of the author.

ARMIN G. WENG

The Muhlenbergs of Pennsylvania. By Paul A. W. Wallace. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1950. 358 pages. \$4.00.

No artist ever painted a picture of Henry Melchior Muhlenberg. The representations that we have of his countenance are copies of the portrait drawn by the celebrated painter Charles Willson Peale, who used his imagination upon the features of Muhlenberg's distinguished sons and made a composite portrait of the patriarch long after his death. Thus in the gallery of portraits the father shines by reflected glory.

So also, in the book before us the student of Church History will find his chief interest in the glory reflected from the distinguished family upon its revered head. The author expressly disclaims any purpose "to trace the course of Muhlenberg's labors as an organizer of the Lutheran Church in America" and his words of high appreciation for Henry Melchior's merit in Lutheran Church History are always incidental to the main object of depicting the personalities and the work of his distinguished sons. But as his three sons and his two sons-in-law were all Lutheran ministers, the entire

volume is of fascinating interest to the student of American Christianity.

Dr. Wallace was formerly on the faculty of Lebanon Valley College and is now consultant to the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission. This book is not his first venture into colonial history, but in the judgment of this reviewer it is by all odds his best. Several years ago his volume on *Conrad Weiser, Friend of Colonist and Mohawk*, father-in-law of the elder Muhlenberg, called wide attention to Wallace as an accurate historian-biographer and a most engaging writer. He also wrote a very interesting Indian history, *The White Roots of Peace*. Now he takes the Muhlenbergs and weaves a four-fold biography into a single narrative, every word of which is true history but every chapter of which is as exciting as any fiction.

The life-story of Patriarch Muhlenberg carries the reader over about a third of the volume, but not without giving a vivid picture of his wife, Anna Maria Weiser, and introducing upon the stage the three boys who are to become the chief heroes of the story. "All three boys may, like Peter, have felt God's hand upon them; but His call was not primarily to the church. Peter was cut out to be a soldier, Frederick a politician, Henry Ernest a scientist."

Then the story of the three sons unrolls rapidly. All the main incidents are carefully investigated and artistically set in their proper framework. One chapter is a critical exploration of the alleged remark by Peter in the pulpit at Woodstock, that "There's a time to fight." And the rest of Peter's exploits and achievements, quite naturally, occupy about one-half of the entire volume. They carry us through much of the Revolutionary War and beyond.

In estimating Frederick Muhlenberg's work in the political circles of early Pennsylvania and in the federal Congress, Dr. Wallace says: "Men were needed who could serve in Congress as checks on the extravagances of such leaders as Hamilton

and Jefferson. The two Muhlenbergs were political balance wheels. They both felt the need of a strong central government, and at the same time they recognized the rights of man. They believed in Jeffersonian democracy—with such qualifications as came natural to good Lutherans brought up with a wholesome heed of Original Sin. The Muhlenbergs in politics were not crusaders. At the same time they had no phobias. They were plain good men, who took each day as it came, passed judgment on policies as they arose, and by their sane common sense and wholesomeness of outlook provided the stabilizing influence the country needed" (p. 274).

Henry Ernest Muhlenberg receives a relatively brief but discriminating account as "The American Linnaeus." The Muhlenberg women also figure prominently in the narrative. Betsy, Peggy, Polly, and Sally married prominent and influential men, but all of them were interesting personalities in their own right, true daughters of Henry Melchior Muhlenberg and granddaughters of Conrad Weiser.

The Muhlenbergs of Pennsylvania worked creatively in American religious and political life when the stream of our national history was just beginning to flow and when the influence of a few leading men could easily determine the whole course of history for generations to come. In this book we stand very near them and observe them closely as they work upon those springs of American history. Through the channels of the church and education, through politics and military encounter, through science and common-sense living, they helped to fashion the young American republic.

Our author has for the most part used primary sources, particularly the English translation of Henry Melchior Muhlenberg's Journals. The abundant footnotes, conveniently gathered at the end of the volume, document his materials very thoroughly and satisfy the reader that the narrative rests upon well authenticated facts. The reader quickly per-

ceives the touch of a scholarly pen. This reviewer discovered only one actual misstatement of fact, and that a very minor one: Helmuth served at Lancaster, not York, before going to Philadelphia (p. 91).

The style is precise and fluent and easy. The narrative proceeds like a well planned story, with occasional surprises, with periods of suspense, and with many pleasant quotations from intimate family letters and from other pertinent documents. The full-page portraits and the ample index, together with the large clear type, help to make a most readable and attractive book. Americans all, ministers and lay, will read this book with pleasure and with much profit.

ABDEL ROSS WENTZ

The Great Awakening in Nova Scotia, 1776-1809. By Maurice W. Armstrong. Hartford: The American Society of Church History, 1948. 138 pages. \$3.00.

This book, a prize essay of the Frank S. Brewer Fund, is volume eight of the *Studies in Church History*, published by the American Society of Church History. The author is professor of History in Ursinus College and shows historical aptitude in this carefully documented study of the Great Awakening in Nova Scotia. It is more than that; it is a history of Christianity in Nova Scotia, 1776-1809. One wishes that more space had been devoted to the Lutherans in and around Lunenburg, for the story of the organization of the mother church, Zion in Lunenburg, though it antedates 1776, is a fascinating story and helps one to understand the problems faced by dissenters in Nova Scotia. The author sketches, but ever so briefly, how the hardy Hanoverians in Lunenburg county solved in their own unique way the problem of remaining Lutheran.

The groups who never affiliated with the established church are dealt with in great detail, among them the Scotch, who brought their Presbyterianism, and the

colonists from New England, their Congregationalism. The author points up how, because of the economic poverty, the frontier ignorance, and the petty persecution on the part of the Anglican-dominated government, it seemed that ultimately these churches would either become Anglican or forget religion entirely.

With this background Dr. Armstrong leads into the Great Awakening in Nova Scotia, which decided a different fate for these churches. He presents in convincing manner, but lacking in drama, the leader of the Great Awakening in the province, Henry Alline, "the Apostle of Nova Scotia." Dr. Armstrong goes into the background of this intrepid leader as a child and as a youth in order to help the reader understand how he became the New Light Apostle.

With whole boat-loads of people coming from the surrounding country to hear this amazing man preach, the Great Awakening in Nova Scotia had begun. There follows the story of his ordination and his itinerant preaching in the wilderness on horseback until his death. The spiritual fervor which Alline engendered had varying effects. In some instances there was new spiritual life; in other cases, congregations were split wide open.

Professor Armstrong's study is particularly important because he throws new light on Alline, who by numerous writers has been called "the ravager of the churches." The author shows that Alline's work was not all destruction, nor was his tireless effort to arouse people to a knowledge of vital religion without positive and lasting results. In hundreds of backwoods homes a new devotion and a new morality were kindled.

The last third of the book is devoted to the literature of the Great Awakening in the province and introduces the reader to the writings of Alline and others. While polite circles in Halifax and Boston were discussing Tom Paine, the backwoodsmen of Nova Scotia and of New

England were singing Henry Alline's hymns. The fact that they were doggerel did not disturb the enthusiastic singers.

The author summarizes the last fifteen years of the eighteenth century as years of religious ferment in Nova Scotia. The Church of England lost a large part of its membership and the remnants of New England Congregationalism were greatly transformed. A new denominationalism succeeded Alline's utter disregard of denominations. Calvinism again came into its own. Ecclesiasticism triumphed, and the Protestant dissenters of Nova Scotia forsook emotion and excitement for orderly growth. In an unexciting but thorough manner Professor Armstrong tells the story of the Great Awakening and what it meant to Nova Scotia.

ARMIN GEORGE WENG

Drawing-Room Conversion. A Sociological Account of the Oxford Group Movement. By Allan W. Eister. Durham: Duke University Press, 1950. 236 pages. \$3.50.

Since most of the literature on the Oxford Group Movement is warmly partisan, the appearance of a study which aims at objectivity is most welcome. In order to secure information about Buchmanism the author attended Group meetings and interviewed adherents in addition to reading available literature. Yet he does not himself claim that his book is definitive. "It is simply an effort to determine what kinds of religious experience were had, what kinds of ideas about personal and social problems were expressed by participants in the movement, and how these might be related to each other and to the structure and organization of the movement." An introductory description of a typical meeting and of its techniques and underlying concepts is followed by a brief history of the several stages through which the movement passed—from personal evangelism and soul surgery to Moral Re-Armament. Separate chapters are then devoted to a description of the movement's external structure, to an

analysis of the Groupists' religious experiences, and to an evaluation of their ethical interests and concerns. The total picture is fair and illuminating.

The study's principal claim to attention, however, lies in its attempt to distinguish sociologically between cult and sect and to apply the alleged features of the cult to Buchmanism. The sect, says Eister, is a closely knit group, while the cult is loosely organized. The membership of the former is exclusive, separated from the world and the church, while the membership of the latter is inclusive, avoiding both the asceticism and the sharply defined ideology of the sect. In addition, "emotionally exhilarating activities and thrill satisfactions" are more characteristic of the cult than of the sect.

The attempt to formulate a precise distinction between sect and cult is commendable, but the author's attempt is not altogether successful. By fairly common consent the Peace Mission Movement of Father Divine is designated a cult, yet it possesses most of the distinguishing features of what Eister calls a sect. To be sure, part of the difficulty lies in the want of agreement, not only with respect to definitions, but also with respect to the classification of particular religious groups. It is a question, however, whether satisfactory distinctions can be made between churches and sects and between sects and cults on merely sociological grounds. This is not to say that Eister's attempt is useless. On the contrary, it should contribute toward the eventual emergence of an acceptable nomenclature.

T. G. TAPPERT

Ethik. By Dietrich Bonhoeffer. Edited by Eberhard Bethge. München: Christian Kaiser Verlag, 1949. 300 pages.

Dietrich Bonhoeffer is known to many Americans through his book *The Cost of Discipleship*. In a review of this book Professor E. H. Wahlstrom tells the life story of Bonhoeffer (*THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY*, Feb., 1950, p. 98). In his foreword to this ethics E. Bethge relates

something of the history of the book. When Bonhoeffer started his work on Christian ethics he regarded its writing as his most important life work. In 1939 he was invited to give the Croall Lectures in Edinburgh, and these lectures were the groundwork of his *Ethics*. Despite the war Bonhoeffer continued his work, although with many interruptions. Parts of his manuscript were hidden in a garden and then dug up again. Some parts of it were in the hands of the Gestapo. When Bonhoeffer died in 1945 the work was not finished, and the parts which had been written were not arranged. E. Bethge received the difficult task of preparing the work of publication, for the material left by Bonhoeffer was considered to be too valuable to be lost.

The circumstances in which the *Ethik* was written have impressed on it a particular sense of urgency. The church had to stand the awful pressure of Nazi rule and of the war, and at the same time it had to be God's representative in the midst of all the spirits of evil which had enveloped the German nation. No superficial quasi-Christianity could avail in those circumstances. The situation tended to open the eyes of earnest Christians to see more sharply than before what was of God and what was of the evil one, what was genuinely Christian and what was error and deception in the cloak of goodness and value. The deceptiveness of human ways to solve the problems of life are sharply revealed in the opening chapter of the *Ethik*. When man is standing before the abyss of evil and wickedness, he can find salvation only in the abyss of divine love which opens up in Christ. Before God man stands judged and condemned in himself. His guilt casts him in shame and death under the judgment of God. But this God is also the God who let the judgment of condemnation pass over himself in Christ. Therefore the penitent sinner finds reconciliation and peace. Only through these experiences of divine judgment and grace can man find

real life. In them he becomes conformed to Christ in his crucifixion and resurrection. Thus recreated he begins to conform to Christ also in his walk and conduct. The church is that portion of mankind in which the form (*Gestalt*) of Christ becomes reality. The church is not a representative of religion. It is the representative of the form of Christ and of being conformed to him in the midst of mankind. The starting point of Christian ethics is this new creation in Christ, this body of Christ in the form of the church, and the process of becoming conformed to Christ in the church. Christ is not a teacher who has given principles, according to which the human society of this world should be shaped. He is the Saviour who delivers men from the guilt and slavery of sin and creates them anew. The highest principle of Christian conduct is not the Kantian one: to conduct himself so that the maxims of his actions could be used as the principles of general legislation. Rather, the Christian asks: Do my actions now help my neighbor to be a man before God?

This is the fundamental viewpoint of Bonhoeffer's ethics. He gives a good and profoundly evangelical treatment of many of the topics which are usually treated in works on Christian ethics. He often refers to Luther and finds himself in agreement with the Reformer.

There are, nevertheless, some points in his treatment toward which we have to take a critical attitude. In speaking of marriage (pp. 116 ff.) Bonhoeffer admits that economic, confessional, social, and racial factors have significance in the selection of the spouse. But in emphasizing the "natural character" of marriage, he lays hardly any emphasis on the fact that unanimity in religious matters has a profound significance for the happiness and success of marital life. Possibly this problem is not "burning" in Germany where the population is not so mixed as in America.

Bonhoeffer is right in stressing that the task of the church is to proclaim the

revelation, or the Word of God, and it is bound to the Holy Scriptures in its testimony of Christ. The preacher is not an exponent of the congregation, but of God to the congregation, and even against the congregation. The office of the ministry is instituted by Christ and does not receive its legitimacy through the will of the church. All this is good and worth considering. But then Bonhoeffer goes on to say (p. 228) that "the Bible belongs essentially to the office of preaching, whereas preaching belongs to the congregation. . . . As to its nature, it is not the devotional book of the congregation. . . . In normal cases the testing of the correctness of preaching does not belong to the congregation but to the oversight of the church government." Here Bonhoeffer seems to lay so much emphasis on the official ministry and its authority at the cost of the general priesthood of believers that his view is not in harmony with the teaching of Scripture and of Luther. His conception of the relationship between the pastor and the congregation, and between the Scriptures and Christians has such a "high church" flavor in it that it is not in harmony with the principles laid down by the Lutheran Reformation. We refer here to Luther's statements in his books *On Christian Liberty* (Weimar ed., 7, 56), *On the Misuse of Masses* (Weimar ed., 8, 489, 514, 495, 503), *To the Christian Nobility* (Weimar ed., 6, 412, 407), *On the Councils and the Churches* (Weimar ed., 50, 632 f., 654). Luther certainly teaches that the office of the ministry is instituted by Christ, but he lays much more emphasis than Bonhoeffer on the general priesthood of believers, and he does not approve such a divestment of it from its powers as Bonhoeffer does. Neither does Luther give the Bible primarily to the office of ministry.

Bonhoeffer has an unusual conception of the function of conscience. He says: "The voice of conscience is the voice of the fallen life which wants to be in harmony at least with itself. It is a call to unity with man himself." "Conscience

does not have to do with man's relationship to God and other men but with his relationship to himself." Although there is much truth in what Bonhoeffer says here, particularly in the case of the unawakened natural man, still his view of conscience is onesided and as such incorrect. Luther believed that in his conscience man is a "man before God" who feels his responsibility before him and his predicament as a guilty sinner. This view of Luther, we think, is in better harmony with Scripture and experience than the view of Bonhoeffer.

In an Appendix Bonhoeffer deals with the question of the three uses of the law: (1) the civil use, for the maintenance of external order and discipline in the temporal state and society, (2) the spiritual use, for working the knowledge and conviction of sin, and (3) the divine law, or the law of Christ, as the standard and rule of the life and conduct of Christians. Bonhoeffer does not agree with this traditional understanding of the various uses of the law. He holds that the entire Decalog is the content of the first or civil use of the law. Its chief exponent is the church, and only in the second place the temporal state, the father of family, etc. The hearers of the civil use are not only unbelievers and the unruly people of this world, but also Christians as to their flesh. According to Bonhoeffer, Luther explains the Decalog in his Catechisms in the sense of the first use. All this is in conflict with the actual teaching of Luther and the Lutheran Confessions. According to them, the first or civil use of the law is not an affair of the church but of the temporal state. It belongs to the church only insofar as Christians too are bound to be loyal to the laws of their temporal government. Christians certainly need the reproofs of the law because of their flesh, for they need to live in a continuing knowledge of their sins. But this belongs to the second or spiritual use of the law and not to its civil use. Although Luther and the Lutheran Confessions speak of the Decalog as the basis of

civil laws, because it is a good summary of "natural law," their actual teaching is that only the second table of the law has to do with civil government. The temporal government is not called to enforce divine worship, of which the first table speaks, except in the sense that it should suppress public blasphemy of God. Luther explained the Decalog in his Catechisms in the sense of the third use of the law, as is seen from his words, "We should fear and love God that we. . . ." Only Christians can fear and love God and so be motivated to do his will. Luther explains several times that the church does not use the Decalog in its teaching as a law of Moses, for it was given to the people of Israel only. The church uses it as a good summary of "natural law," the eternal law of God, which was given to men in creation and written in their hearts, and which is again written in the hearts of Christians by the Holy Spirit and given them in the law of Christ.

Bonhoeffer is not the only theologian who confuses the different uses of the law. The same is done, *e.g.*, by Ragnar Bring of Lund, Sweden ("Gesetz und Evangelium und der dritte Brauch des Gesetzes in der lutherischen Theologie," *Zur Theologie Luthers*, I, Helsinki, 1934). Bring, too, includes in the first use what actually belongs to the third use of the law.

In spite of these and some other shortcomings, the *Ethik* of Bonhoeffer contains a great deal of good material. We mention here a statement which is of interest in our time. He says (pp. 198 ff.) that the "Culture Protestantism" and "Pseudo-Lutheranism" of past decades regarded man's temporal calling and the temporal orders (or mandates: state, society, marriage, work, etc.) as holy in themselves. A faithful fulfillment of one's duties as citizen, laborer, father, or mother is a service of God in itself. Bonhoeffer is right in saying that the New Testament never declares the temporal orders and the fulfillment of temporal

callings as holy in themselves. Neither does Luther. One's temporal calling is only the place where one has to answer the call of Christ. Man serves God only as a believer who lives in fellowship with Christ, not by the mere fulfillment of his temporal calling. Even in our time there are theologians who think that the view which Bonhoeffer calls a "pseudo-Lutheran" conception is the teaching of Luther.

URAS SAARNIVAARA

Död och Levande Moral. By Margit Wohlin. Stockholm: Blom and Söner Boktryckeri, 1950. 162 pages. Kr. 4:75.

This is a volume on Christian ethics, written in a popular style which has not sacrificed depth in the interest of popularity. The author stresses that the primary problem of our age, as of every age, is spiritual and moral. The problems of modern industrialization, communism, fascism, the difficulties involved in international relations and other factors indicate clearly that what our generation needs is something to give meaning and direction to life.

The inadequacy of idealism and utilitarianism in ethics as an answer to this quest is clearly set forth. The author also emphasizes that morality is something more than a matter of convention. Morality is individualistic, but it is also social, and self-realization and service to our society find their synthesis in the spirit of Calvary's cross.

The volume contains a great deal of illustrative material from history, the history of religion, and psychology. The thesis of the book is that the only satisfactory basis for an ethic is the Christian faith. Faith is conceived of in existential terms which makes it vital and dynamic.

The author has done a very fine piece of work in coming to grips with the fundamental problems of our day and the problems of morality. The book would have lost nothing of its value if the author

had refrained from endorsing the Moral Re-Armament movement.

A. D. MATTSO

Dogmatics in Outline. By Karl Barth.
New York: Philosophical Library,
1949. 155 pages. \$3.75.

Not every man has his moment or place of special illumination. For most of us the lights in life are rather generally dispersed among multiple persons, places, occasions, and institutions, and gleam out of a multitude of small and large experiences. For the few who have a peak at some Aldersgate or upon a river in Lam-barene there are millions who can in retrospect point only to gradual rises and modest humps!

One of the more memorable humps in my own experience came back to me when I read Karl Barth's *Outline*. In the 1920's I was in college and seminary and, in the fashion of many of that generation, was a self-conscious "liberated"! We read H. L. Mencken's heady and heedless and uproarious *Prejudices*; we soaked our souls in the new poetry—which seemed to confirm us in our opinion that since the first syllables of recorded time there had been no sorrow like unto our sorrow; we thought James Joyce was the greatest artist since Milton. Religion, too, was a-boiling. It was, we believed, soon to become less crabbed and austere. Mr. Fosdick was mightily at work loosening upon the joints.

Then, on a certain day during my first year in the seminary, a professor said to me, "Emil Brunner is making a speech in Dayton tonight; we must hear him." What I took to the speech wasn't much; what I brought home (due principally to a post-speech soiree with my professor and Emil Brunner in the grill of the old Hotel Sinton) was, and remains, one of those humps in a young man's experience that is never flattened out by time's rollers. For I had known all along that there was a large fly in the regnant theological ointment of my salad days! But

to give it a local habitation and a name was beyond me.

Brunner's lecture that night was really an introduction to the dialectical way in theology. While, to be sure, Brunner and Barth have long since said *no* to each other's ways and works, the first experience and this little Barth volume are of a piece. For there I heard a new kind of theological address to my generation and to my world; it had the authentic ring of a faith responsible to the Scriptures, an acute and broad historical consciousness, a method of operating with a sharper and more appropriate blade than that of philosophical idealism, and a passion for communicative relevancy that was decisive for me, and, I believe, for an entire generation.

That introduction to dialectical method has now more than twenty years of vast productivity behind it. *Dogmatics in Outline* is a brief, proportioned, and representative chunk of the thought of Karl Barth for the common reader. The content is not new; the plan of the book follows the structure of his earlier *Credo* (1936). The earlier lectures were sixteen in number, and were a sequential treatment of the phrases of the Creed. This volume is a similar commentary on the Creed. But the chapters are shorter, the erudition is less obvious, the language is less technical, the paradoxes are not so flamboyantly flung out, and the communication is less oblique.

Within the last fifteen years Barth has addressed himself to practical political problems in such a way as to bring consternation and confusion to many who have been decisively helped by his earlier work. There is, therefore, a danger that Barth's magnificent theological work shall become known to the present decade only in the light of his later, and more dubious, activities and assertions. Because of that peril it is just and good that this condensation of his point of view concerning every major theme of theology should have been made available in English.

The shadow of Barth has fallen across every theologian in Christendom since World War I. Regardless of varying and violent evaluation of his work, Barth actually constitutes the point of cleavage in theological method and consciousness since Schliermacher; and anyone who proposes to operate in the field of contemporary theology has got to come to terms with him.

JOSEPH SITTLER, JR.

Lust for Power. By Joseph Haroutunian. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1949. 174 pages. \$3.00.

Asserting that "our age has become obsessed with the problem of power," Professor Haroutunian distinguishes between "love of power for good" and "lust for power" and undertakes to examine how the former becomes transformed into the latter so as to create the major social concern of our time, the fear that our enormous technological power will be misused for universal ruin.

The author, who is a member of the faculty of McCormick Theological Seminary (Presbyterian), Chicago, pleads for a new understanding of power as it affects the human soul. The traditional way of dealing with power, matching power with power, has not only proved ineffective but is much too perilous today. It reflects, moreover, the too simple conceptions of power that have prevailed, as, for example, the belief that man seeks power merely because he wants to be secure. Ubiquitous bidding for power and the only too numerous and interminable conflicts between individuals, groups, nations, and continents compel us to recognize that there is abroad an irrational, joyless lust for power which is a passion for power for its own sake. This lust springs from despair for life, a despair that has its origin in modern man's turning away from the Christian faith. The only cure for lust for power is a renewal of the "love of life" through a return to the faith whose catholic statement is the Apostles' Creed.

The reader will find Haroutunian at his best in the analysis of the lust for power, particularly in the penetrating description of the new setting which lust has in our machine-dominated society. In the ordinary man, this lust takes the form of substituting the having and enjoying of "goods" for the seeking of the "good." "Men have always loved comfort, but men with machines love it with a new passion" (p. 11). What is pathetic in the common man's case becomes tragic in the lusty power-seeker's impersonal domination of his fellows. Increasingly sure of their control of nature through machines that are passive and non-resisting servants, men are tempted more and more to lord it over their fellowmen. Accustomed to non-resistance in the machine (one is tempted to ask if the professor drives an automobile), we become irritable when human beings offer resistance.

Wrestling with a difficult and complex subject, and rightly dissatisfied with simple analyses, Haroutunian deserves credit for his many provocative insights. In all fairness to the author, it must be remembered that his primary aim is to offer "a radical and illuminating analysis of lust." In view of the fact, however, that he does make some effort toward a constructive solution near the end of the book, it should be noted that the "antidote to lust" given is inadequate as it stands. Perhaps we can suggest some of the reasons for this and also express the hope that the author will present a fuller treatment of the constructive answer.

Coming to the last chapter in which the "antidote to lust" is given, the reviewer, by this time having a rather vivid feeling of the power of lust and of the despair to which it leads, was disappointed in failing to find a clear and sufficiently detailed answer in which Christian faith and love are made to stand out as the only adequate solution, an answer for which—as the author rightly maintains—there is "no substitute" (p. 159). We are heartily in accord with his assertion that "the soul of Western man was

formed by the Christian faith, and this faith alone can nourish and sustain it" (p. 159), provided the author does not mean to deny that other influences also have had something to do with the "forming" of that "soul."

The weakness of Haroutunian's solution is not in his general affirmation of Christianity, but it is at least partly in the failure to show in more specific terms how faith and love can be brought to bear on life and particularly upon the problem of power. From one who says that there is "too much misunderstanding of the Christian faith" (p. 171) and courageously asserts that "neither the superstitions of the believers nor the denials of the unbelievers will do" (p. 145), one naturally expects a clearer statement in regard to how Christian faith can function to overcome lust for power in both personal and collective spheres. Instead, the author finds it necessary to dwell at some length not only on the ambiguity of human experience, but also on the "ambiguity of the Christian faith" (p. 160). The great symbol of this faith, the Apostles' Creed, he says, is not to be taken as a "set of literal symbols. . . . As language about God, [these symbols] are ambiguous metaphors" (pp. 160-161). Responsible Christian thinkers, of course, are painfully aware of the difficulties confronting the theologian who would give conceptual clarity to the insights of his faith, and we wish to make no brief for either arid literalism or authoritarian dogmatism. Are we not, however, though one say the Creed is not to be taken "literally," still faced with the task of interpreting and applying it, especially when the problem at hand—that of power—is not only personal but of such tremendous social proportions? One is left with the uneasy feeling that in Haroutunian's only too brief statement of the "antidote" the discussion of how the Creed is to be construed is only more fuel for the fire for those who are convinced that Christianity is irrelevant to the problems of our day for the very reason that it is "ambiguous."

The author's fondness for the word "ambiguous" takes us to "semantics." Some philosophers of the sophist type are properly satirized for one-sided devotion to analysis of the meaning of words to the neglect of greater issues (p. 115). We theologians and preachers, who are notorious for ambiguous words, phrases, and sentences, may well pause, however, to learn something from semantics. The word "ambiguity," for example, can be used too ambiguously. Statements such as the author's, "We are inevitably Christians" (p. 167), leave this reader puzzled and the context does not seem to help much.

Although this review is already too long, I cannot help expressing disagreement with the author's statement (p. 22) that the *primary* differences between "the new capitalism [where executives and managers rather than property owners wield power] and communism is the difference in the *loci* of power" in the two systems. In capitalism machine power is in the hands of industrialists, in communism in the hands of the politicians. Everything else, the "complicated and confusing" remainder, he says, is secondary. Here is an excellent example of the fallacy of oversimplification and unqualified generalization which is fatal in dealing with complex social issues. However strong may be the bid for power in American capitalism, surely the legal, social, and moral restraints that our democratic society imposes cannot be dismissed as secondary and unimportant.

VILJO K. NIKANDER

Eternal Values in Religion. By James Bissett Pratt. Foreword by Willard L. Sperry. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1950. 162 pages. \$2.00.

In a belated legacy the distinguished professor of philosophy at Williams College has made what is probably his final gift to American religious and academic circles. Professor Pratt was one of the foremost teachers of the psychology of religion and is known by his *The Reli-*

gious Consciousness, which appeared several decades ago, and is still a book to be reckoned with. His present work consists of a series of seven essays grouped around the general subject of worship. The nature of these essays is indicated in their titles: *The Psychology of Worship*; *The Justification of Worship*; *Religion and the Mind*; *The Mystic's Sense of Presence*; *The Nature of Christianity*; *Faith, Worship, and Sincerity*; and *Knowledge and Religious Experience*.

This is basically a religious book although the discussion is framed in psychological and philosophical terms. Throughout there is evident a spirit of sympathy, insight, and good will toward religion and toward the institution of religion, the church.

Eternal Values in Religion is an extremely suggestive book for the pastor or student who is accessible. The author's observations, his gentle criticisms, his proposals—all are designed to arouse interest for the good estate of religion in our communities. No reader is likely to accept all that the author maintains; but, then, this is not the kind of book to be read in a literalistic spirit. Indeed, it is a book of the spirit, rather than of the letter, and should be received as such.

Any person seriously concerned with the church and our Christian faith should desire to know what Professor Pratt has to say about "worship at its best," "prayer," "the communion," "the function of the church school as an instrument to develop prayer, and song, and reverence," "the ontological character of worship," "religious faith," or "the place of the mystics." These are samplings, taken at random, of the subjects discussed in the pages of this book. The perceptive reader will not miss the considerable apologetic value of Professor Pratt's remarks.

In *Eternal Values in Religion* one meets a noble, devout, and disciplined mind, in meditation upon the deep things of the spirit. Here one can be instructed, and also edified. One could do much worse than use this little book for a

season of devotion and meditation in his oratory or study.

GEORGE R. SELTZER

Människa och Kristen. By Bishop Arvid Runestam. Stockholm: Sv. Kyrkans Diakonistyrrelses Bokförlag, 1949. 216 pages. Kr. 6:75.

In this volume the scholarly bishop of the Swedish diocese of Karlstad has published a series of essays and addresses that center about the problem of man and his relation to Christ. Is the humanist and idealist right when he declares that the highest personal attainment is reached by becoming a self-sufficient man without reference to the divine? Or is it as a Christian man that the reality of human life is reached? Bishop Runestam's answer is unequivocal. We are only truly human when the door to the Father's house has been opened to us by Jesus Christ and we are in our Father's house. We may be God's problem children, but we are his own when he will not cease to love even though he must pursue us into the far country.

The discussions are divided into four general sections. The first section deals with the need for religion. The bishop wants to combat a popular notion of our day that religion is a special trait that some people have and some do not have. It is a false science of psychiatry that classifies people into religious and a-religious beings.

"Does man need religion? Not if by religion is meant a spiritual enjoyment among other luxuries, a stimulus that I enjoy in proper proportions, or a Sunday dress that I don on festive occasions. Not if I mean by religion an atmosphere that surrounds me and gives a lovely unreality to my existence. But men need religion if by this we mean a Christianity that seeks to give meaning and content to life and helps me answer the questions whence and why and the responsibility of being and becoming a true person, that helps me with my personal problems and failures, my loneliness and frustrations in

the world, with my conscience and my sin, my relation to other people, my children, my wife, my family, my fellow-workers, my work, and my calling. Religion in the form of Christianity is made for man, who needs to be oriented in existence and find clarity in his position, who needs order and concentration in his life, who needs a conviction as a guiding star, and a faith in which he can live and struggle for, and die."

Bishop Runestam is concerned for his countrymen who seem to be indifferent to the church and the need of God. In that situation the church must follow her Lord's command and face men with their calling in God and his judgment.

To be a man is to live in forgiveness, surrounded by forgiveness on all sides. The modern psychiatrist who is afraid of neuroses that come from limiting one's desires only creates despair and seven-fold worse neuroses by encouraging moral license. Only Christianity with her absolute moral standards and a doctrine of forgiveness is adequate to modern man. The church has no other alternative than to draw the lines of evil against God's law and call for commitment and discipleship. Only in following Christ's standard can moralism and idealism be saved for the making of a true person.

Section two deals with the commitment that God asks. It is he who has faith in us even when we are lost and separated from him. We must hold fast to his faithfulness and love.

"Faith in man—not at the cost of faith in God, not at the price of our insight into our own lostness and total helplessness in the place which Luther calls sin, death, devil, and Hell. On the contrary, faith in man, won and deepened by faith and love God has given to us; . . . to believe others in God, with God's faith, to give ourselves totally by faith to him and find his strength."

The last section of the book is devoted to three essays on the relation of religion and health. In the social welfare program of the state to bring health to men's bod-

ies there can be no reality unless there is moral and spiritual health and a standard based on the Commandments. The bishop makes an appeal for spiritual and religious renewal and a sturdy faith that shall bring moral soundness. Not only must the medical doctor be used with all his scientific resources, but the times demand a spiritual *Seelsorge* by the church as well. Pastoral counseling is a great need for the modern man filled with the fears and frustrations of modern society. Personal counseling, but counseling that leads to group fellowship in the life of the church through cells of inner fellowship are the method he urges.

After reading Runestam's conception of human personality that can be fulfilled only as it finds its frame of reference in the Christian faith, there is a strong feeling that it is correct to speak of Christian humanism. Man's nature is fulfilled by knowing freedom from self and abandonment to Christ who has the resources that can make for completion. Here is a sound, Lutheran, biblical psychology. "To be saved means, when seeking to have one's disturbing frustrations resolved, that one finds heaven overarching all one's troubles. It means to find a new fellowship with other people. But it is a fellowship in which there is a third party: Jesus Christ. It is to be able to say "yes" to life and be a positive person. But all this via that brokenness in one's life that is known as forgiveness of sin."

Bishop Runestam's book is open only to those who read his language. But there are chapters that could well be translated for others.

CLIFFORD ANSGAR NELSON

The Dilemma of the Idealist. By Davis Bryn-Jones. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1950. 278 pages. \$3.00.

It appears that the word "idealism" has been, is, and always will be a problem for educated people. The author of this book recognizes it as such and tells us in simple, clear language that his book

"is intended for the perplexed." It can be said at once, and in equally clear language, that David Bryn-Jones sheds a great deal of valuable light on the problem and accordingly helps considerably to reduce the number of perplexed.

At the outset it must be understood what the book does and what it does not try to explain. Teachers and students of philosophy will be inclined, as I was, to open it eagerly in the hope that it is another and much-needed treatise on the persistent problem of *philosophical* idealism. This it is not. The author is not a philosopher, at least in the technical or academic sense of the word, but a professor of International Politics at Carleton College, Northfield, Minnesota. He was born and educated in South Wales, did graduate work and was a minister in England, and has been a teacher at Carleton College since 1936. He is also author of *Frank B. Kellogg: A New Biography*, and *Toward a Democratic New Order*. What he is concerned to analyze in this third book is the problem of the "practical" idealist, that is, the problem of the person who, in religion, in politics, and in international relations, is devoted to ideals but who, precisely because of such devotion, finds himself inevitably faced with dilemmas, perplexities, and the temptation—perhaps the necessity—of compromise. In addressing itself to this particular problem the book is stimulating, realistic in the best sense, always alert to the psychological tensions of the idealist, and constructive in its suggestions as to a solution of the problem.

The sound empirical basis on which the theme of the book rests is that there are "sharp contradictions of the ideal and the actual" and that these contradictions are "never more apparent or more disturbing than in ages of crisis" (p. ix). That "ours is an age of crisis" he is safe, if not original, in observing. "Agreement in principle is so easy and agreement in policy is so difficult!" he tells us. The problem of our time is the subject of Book I of this volume, and this the

author sees as the issue of the individual's moral attitude toward war. In five chapters he analyzes the typical case of pacifism as an expression of the religion of the idealist, examining pacifism in its religious setting, as a matter of principle on the one hand and policy on the other, and finally noting the poignant conflicts which arise for the idealist in time of actual warfare.

Book II becomes a little more specific both in the author's manner of writing and in subject matter. It is concerned more especially with the church as it, and its allegedly Christian members, face the "dilemma." The improvement noted in the second Book, besides the greater precision of expression, is due to the fact that Bryn-Jones now uses the historical approach and broadens the base of the discussion to include three main issues: slavery, the role of the state, and private property. From the historical point of view he observes that in the apostolic age "a definitive clash had not occurred" (p. 117), *i.e.*, between conscience and the external order. Moreover, he points out—and it reveals his awareness of biblical views—most of the writers of the New Testament and the early Christians assumed that the existing order would soon pass away. Before long Christians and the church did develop two main positions, which I should call the absolutist, allowing no compromise, and the relativist, sanctioning compromise. The author's conclusion is worth pondering: The church "asserted [those] ideals, declaring at the same time, however, that they were impossible for ordinary men and women. . . . In this way the Church was able to be both idealist and realist" (p. 147).

The third Book offers a seven-chapter discussion of the problems in the modern world, by which the author means a study of the functions and dangers of idealism and the proper role of compromise. The church, he believes, has a divided conscience presumably because its members can not agree on basic moral

judgments. Moreover, he shrewdly points out that both the church and its members, however they may try to be separate from the world, do as a matter of fact live in the world and hence necessarily reflect in some measure the judgments of their culture. Professor Bryn-Jones' discussion of the position of the uncompromising idealist, as exhibited in Woodrow Wilson, is excellent because it is discerning and balanced. The results of Wilson's position were, of course, tragic. The author wisely asks what the same attitude would do to the United Nations in this crucial decade if absolute idealists determined the policy. He concludes by discussing two types of compromise, the first of which accepts "the partial good because the greater good is not immediately attainable," the second of which consists of a choice between two evils. The dangers of the first type he correctly states are that this type of compromise will become habitual, and, more seriously, that "a small reform may be the worse enemy of the great reform"—as exemplified by the so-called Counter-Reformation! The crux of the problem, as he sees it, is this: is it ever justifiable to resort to what one believes to be wrong solely on the ground that the alternative is even more wrong? He cites as an example Great Britain joining France, as she had promised, in resistance to Germany, thereby favoring war rather than "dishonor." Be the problems as they may, the positive function of the ideal remains, namely, "to embody itself progressively in the reformation of customs and institutions in the widening sympathies of human communities" (p. 252).

This book is important for all responsible leaders today. However, two criticisms at least must be stated. In a book, the whole sweep of which is concerned with a dilemma, one reasonably expects a clear statement of the dilemma. This Professor Bryn-Jones does not offer, though he repeatedly refers to quite different situations as what one might call delimmatic. Now, the term dilemma has

its home base, so to speak, in logic, and any standard text in logic usually has a chapter or two defining and illustrating the simple and complex dilemma. I have the suspicion, which could be documented at length if space permitted, that the author has never clearly faced the question of what a dilemma is, and the result is a serious ambiguity which plagues the entire book. He refers to "the dilemma of the idealist," the Christian dilemma, and the like, but in such ways that one concludes either (1) that there is no single one which can be denominated "*the* dilemma of the idealist," or (2) that there are a number of alleged dilemmas created by the necessity of moral judgment and action. The entire study would have been greatly strengthened if the author had defined the issues in terms of a clear-cut dilemma at the outset. Having done this, I believe he would have discovered both simple and complex dilemmas and, moreover, several instructive varieties of each.

Again, there is the difficult problem of ends and means. Are the ends really agreed upon by most people, as the author suggests, so that we differ only regarding the means of their realization? That this is the base in the present conflict of cultures is seriously to be questioned. At one point the author says "The claims of the ideal are not universally recognized, nor are the demands obeyed by the majority of Christians" (p. 141). He would probably be much nearer to the facts if he had recognized from the beginning that the problem of moral decision and action arises from differing judgments as to both ends and means.

Throughout the entire discussion a famous statement of Hegel's ran through my mind, and I fully expected it, in generally so excellent a book, to occur at any time. It may be freely rendered: The choices of life are rarely between black and white but usually between chocolate and dark brown.

CHARLES W. KEGLEY

A Philosophy of Life. By Richard N. Bender. New York: Philosophical Library, 1949. 249 pages. \$3.75.

The professor of philosophy at Baker University, Baldwin, Kansas, has written an introduction to philosophy which serves the dual purpose of providing a text for an elementary college course and affording interested non-academic readers a stimulus to philosophical thinking. The author's point of view is personalistic theism. The uniqueness of the book lies in the attempt to develop philosophy directly out of concrete life-situations in the contemporary world with only minimal and arbitrary references to historical and systematic philosophy. The result is a presentation which is always clear and crisp but highly over-simplified and carrying an overtone of naive faith in the ability of "empirical," "objective," "accurate," "simple and direct," "fair and tough minded," "patient," and "coherent" reasoning to solve all human problems.

The profound issues of God, freedom, and immortality, which have baffled the great philosophers through the ages, are therefore bravely tackled and subdued. A good example is furnished by the conclusion of the chapter "On Knowing God." "The man who has faced the philosophical evidence for the probability of the existence of God and who has achieved the three steps in the experience of Divine Presence is one who has foundations for a faith that will not easily be dispelled. God then becomes not merely a logical abstraction but a personal acquaintance. . . . The experience of the finding of God and the necessity of the requirements which make such finding possible has as its evidence the accounts of hundreds of thousands of qualified minds. . . . This is as rationally verifiable as mother love, as the aesthetic effectiveness of a sunset . . . (pp. 145-146).

The author is sincere in his efforts to help young people to make life "add up" to something meaningful. And he is guilty of no more credulity and superficiality than many who approach philosophy from

a naturalistic point of view. Yet he reminds one less of a Socratic midwife than of the well-meaning little boy who used a pair of scissors to snip the silken thread binding a butterfly to the cocoon from which it was struggling to emerge.

Theologically the book is allied with the kind of thought which believes in synergism rather than grace, immortality of the soul rather than resurrection from the dead.

The lists of review questions and supplementary readings, as well as the sprightly style of the book and the abundance of illustrative material, will be appreciated by the beginner in philosophy.

T. A. KANTONEN

Enduring Satisfaction: A Philosophy of Spiritual Growth. By William P. McEwen. New York: Philosophical Library, 1949. 370 pages. \$4.75.

The author, who is professor of philosophy at Hofstra College, is a disciple of Edgar Sheffield Brightman. His book is the product of an advanced seminar which aimed "to integrate the student's knowledge into a systematic world-view." The world-view presented is a kind of modified Hegelian process philosophy operating in a Whiteheadian cosmological setting.

Only a philosopher would dare to put so much diverse material into one book and offer it to the public as an effort at integration. There is a wealth of quotations which makes the book a useful sourcebook for modern ideas. The extensive notes found at the end of each chapter show the wide ramifications of modern man's knowledge and indicate at the same time the confused state of his thinking.

The author deserves credit for persistently trying to deal with these ramifications and to order this state of confusion. Even though the result may not give the impression of being a masterpiece of clarity, one is aware that the author holds a coherent philosophical position

which he has attained only after strenuous critical thinking. Clergymen trained in the tradition of philosophical idealism will be happy to note that the voice of idealism has not been entirely silenced in America by the thunder of naturalism and the "jamming" tactics of logical positivism.

From the theological point of view this book must be recognized as a type of modern Gnosticism. The author states: "Man's quest for spiritual growth is interpreted in terms of any mental activity involved in the purposive self-realization of ideal values. Although religious consecration is not excluded, it is only one among other forms of spiritual processes as we conceive them." Even though this is a value-centered philosophy, the author nowhere considers axiological questions at any length. If he had he might have learned something from Kierkegaard and others of the distinctive nature of Christian values. This in turn might have inclined him to give a more sympathetic hearing to the claims of theology.

M. W. BOYER

Ministerial Ethics and Etiquette. By Nolan B. Harmon. Nashville: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1950. 215 pages. \$2.50.

When an old friend comes by, bearing evidence of being much improved with the years, it is indeed a pleasure.

Nolan B. Harmon's *Ministerial Ethics and Etiquette* is such a friend which bears evidence of improvement.

All Lutheran churches, in their adaptation to the American setting, have brought much with them from European homelands; but they have also learned much from the American environment in which the churches, whose collective voice is the dominant tone in this book, have in the past been so influential. We acknowledge with gratefulness the many lessons and find summarized within these pages proper manners and modes in ministerial relationships.

It is not a textbook, nor a substitute for a textbook, in Pastoral Theology, for it does not bring to bear the "one and only rule for faith and life" so much as it reflects a cross section of opinion, a broad consensus representing a wide variety of attitudes toward the Bible.

We find no attempt to discern the confessional implications of various ministerial functions, where voices still cry to the prophet of God, "Speak unto us smooth things," and propriety is so apt to say, "Do so."

But one does not ask of a book that which it was not intended to be, and *Ethics and Etiquette* will take its important place beside the manuals in Pastoral Theology and continue to teach us the good and proper way of saying and doing so many things in church work.

T. F. GULLIXSON

Gospel Parallels. A Synopsis of the First Three Gospels according to the Revised Standard Version of 1946. New York: Thomas Nelson & Sons, 1949. 191 pages.

The Huck Synopsis of the first three Gospels, edited by Hans Lietzmann and published in 1936, is probably the best work of its kind in print. The book under review is a reproduction of that work in the text of the Revised Standard Version. The increasing use of that version in worship and Bible study makes the present Synopsis the more highly desirable and should stimulate the study of scripture.

This work is notable for three additions to the usual presentation. First, in addition to the canonical parallels, the non-canonical parallels are given. This contribution saves the student endless time and effort in tracing quotations scattered in writings of the Fathers throughout the first six centuries of the church's history. Second, manuscript authority for readings which vary from the traditional text is given in full at the bottom of each page. To one who is acquainted with the principal manuscripts, this information is in-

valuable. It also should stimulate the diligent student of the Gospels to become familiar with the sources for our text. Third, parallel passages from the Fourth Gospel are quoted. This invention largely obviates the difficulty of the four-Gospel text.

In the opinion of this reviewer, the work under consideration is one of the most helpful guides to Gospel study to be offered in years. Every theological student must have it. Every minister will appreciate increasingly its usefulness.

The large page, the printing, and the quality of the paper all commend its regular use. The publishers are to be congratulated for making this Synopsis available at so reasonable a price.

ARTHUR C. P. HAYS

A Pictorial Gospel. By Eliot Hodgkin. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1950. 212 pages. \$3.50.

A more accurate descriptive title for this book would be "The Gospel Story in Word and Picture." Selections from the Authorized Version of the four Gospels are arranged in chronological order on the left-hand pages to form a consecutive narrative of the life of Christ. On the right-hand pages are reproductions of works of art which illustrate the narrative, the author's intention being that "each should thereby gain fresh meaning and interest." There are some familiar pictures from Rembrandt, Raphael, Dürer, Fra Angelico, etc., but many unfamiliar works are also included. The artistic merit of the various illustrations impresses the lay reader as being quite unequal, but they do serve to give the Gospel story greater vividness and a closer association with life. The book could be used effectively for devotional purposes in a family with small children, enabling the Gospel to reach them through the eye as well as the ear.

J. P. MILTON

Der Mensch und die Mächte. Edited by Adolf Wischmann. Hamburg: Reich & Heidrich, 1949. 64 pages.

Besides the editor there are four contributors to this volume of addresses and sermons delivered in the main at a round table conference for Germany university students which was sponsored by the student congregation of the University of Göttingen and held during July, 1948. The other contributors are R. Wittram (*Die Nationalisierung Europas seit dem 18. Jahrhundert*); Otto Weber (*Der autonome Mensch*); L. Raifer (*Die Abhängigkeit des Menschen von der Wirtschaft*); and W. Trillhaas (*Sermon*).

If what the volume offers is a fair sample of what is being done for German students spiritually, and if what is said in the preface about the response—particularly the response from non-theological students—is indicative for the movement in general, then the student service of the Lutheran Church in Germany is to be congratulated. There is something reassuring in the emphasis which these discussions seem to place on the basic evangelical principles—the helplessness of natural man, the atoning of Christ, the means of grace, sin, the righteousness of faith, a wholesome attitude toward the secular calling, and an active participation in civic affairs. One relishes the direct, unstilted, and concrete manner in which these men approach their subject—one exception, perhaps, is a sermon by the editor himself which savors a little of the traditional obeisance to the intelligentsia.

EMIL W. MATZNER

Last Chance. Edited by Clara Urquhart. Boston: The Beacon Press, 1948. 182 pages. \$2.50.

This volume presents eleven questions "on issues determining our destiny." Answers are given "by 26 leaders of thought of 14 nations." It is not an easy volume to review, especially in brief space.

In the Introduction the editor says that "the world for many is a dark and frightening place." Only "an absolute minority" are "conscious of the crisis." "The mastery of inanimate matter over living things is probably the greatest tragedy of all time for humanity." "The individual is in no way equipped to meet the terrible spiritual, social, and psychological problems" created by scientific discovery. "Man no longer has a spiritual self-confidence. The machine age has had a soul destroying effect—a commercial civilization resulting in a negation of ethics." Another negative is "the growth of officialdom and bureaucracy which made spontaneous living impossible." The specialist has brought "many negative factors." The industrial system has damaged moral and spiritual development. "Everything" is presenting influences "bent on robbing man of all confidence in his thinking." Admitting a solution of the problems approached "in the manner taught by Christ," it is declared that there are not enough teachers to "indicate the right approach to their solution" in our era. There are too few "philosophers" who remind men of what Christ preached. Religion in a profound ethical sense is "no longer a spiritual force" in the world. "The Churches have in the main concerned themselves only with preaching morality and Christianity, without doing much about implementing their injunctions."

These and other statements present a dreary, desolate picture of the world. One but wonders if there is any chance.

Following the introduction there are thirteen general statements on world problems as indicated in the eleven questions or introductory remarks, given by thirteen writers. Then follow the eleven questions and answers to these questions on world problems by fifteen writers.

These questions are too elaborate to state in full, but in brief they are: 1. One world or two? How avoid a split and a third world war? 2. The United States

and Russia—is it possible for these two nations to exist peacefully in the same world? 3. Germany, Japan, and China. Is a reorganization and reeducation acceptable to the United States and Russia possible? 4. The uses of propaganda. How possible to stop misuse of propaganda and undo its harmful effects. 5. The abolition of want. 6. The meaning of democracy. 7. Education for internationalism. How make it a practical reality? 9. The problem of overpopulation. 10. Preparation for citizenship. 11. Spiritual and moral regeneration.

The immediate task is to maintain peace. To this end leaders of thought, "men who have remained miraculously sane and whole in a world of disconnected and disjointed people," are selected to point the way to peace through answers to all the questions posed.

The collaborators present an interesting and varied group of opinions. Some are from a definite and positive Christian standpoint, others are naturally from other viewpoints. Perhaps a difficulty is posed for the reader by the unequal length of the answers. Some of the writers speak on various problems, others only on a few. The book presents a cross section of what men in fourteen nations think about the problems presented and how to meet the crises and the fear that they present. The editor presents these opinions as evidence of what "the world's best thinkers" have to say. The book may furnish interesting reading for individuals or for study groups. This reviewer does not see the church as complete a failure as the editor, nor does he feel that the book presents a solution for the problems discussed. The answers by the various writers do not reach anything like agreement, in fact many of them are at opposite poles. It is to be hoped that readers will find something stabilizing in a disturbed world.

JOHN B. MOOSE

A Preacher's Primer. By David A. MacLennan. New York: Oxford University Press, 1950. 113 pages. \$1.50.

The author of this booklet was the successful pastor of Timothy Eaton Memorial Church in Toronto for fourteen years and is now professor of Preaching and Pastoral Care at Yale Divinity School.

The book is exactly what the title says: a primer. What the choke is to the engine of an automobile this book can be to the preacher who reads it. It will help him get started, or it may give him a "shot in the arm" to keep him going. Its literary charm (Paul Scherer is referred to frequently!), its pastoral wisdom, the numerous and well-chosen quotations—all this will undoubtedly inspire the preacher.

Based on lectures given at the Annual Conference for Ministers at McCormick Theological Seminary in the summer of 1949, the contents belong to what is sometimes called "Pastoral Homiletics." Thus *A Preacher's Primer* belongs to that succession of writings in the history of homiletics which has its beginnings with Chrysostom's *Concerning the Priesthood* and Augustine's *De Doctrina Christiana*. In purpose and style MacLennan's booklet closely resembles Paul Scherer's *For We Have This Treasure*.

HELMUT T. LEHMANN

A Boy Meets Luther. By A. G. Joelsson.

Translated by Ruth Jacobson Ullberg from the Swedish. Illustrated by Edwin K. Holmer. Rock Island: Augustana Book Concern, 1950. 293 pages. \$2.75.

This book, intended for pre-confirmation readers, is fascinating reading for every age. An elderly gentleman close to eighty recommends it highly and my own seven-year-old boy reads it eagerly. The younger children in my family, ages five and three, enjoy hearing it read and the discussions that follow in their play testify to its ability to instruct in an interesting manner.

When Sven of the Pine Hill family is introduced to the Small Catechism by his father, he is taken on an imaginary visit to the Wittenberg of Luther's day. Luther tells him about the writing of the handbook, his own opinion of its value, and shows them the charts he has lettered and hung about the home so that his boy Hans can learn it easier. If the title leads the reader to expect a child's life of Luther, he will be surprised to find that this is all that Luther's personality has to do with the book's plot.

Back at Pine Hill Sven is ready now to have the Catechism explained to him. The everyday happenings in the community, the church, the school, the family, and among the pet animals are used by Sven's unusually capable father to instruct him in the Catechism, line by line. The climax of the book is the same climax as the Catechism—the Sacrament of the Altar.

Home situations explain the Ten Commandments. While on a mountain vacation, the Apostles' Creed, beginning with creation, is fittingly explained. The experience of John, the guide, explains the atonement. John wandered away from home against his parents' wishes and was trapped by two boulders in the mountain wilderness. The guide found him in time to rescue him from the wolves but not without a severe fight in which he was marked for life with scars. In gratitude, John gave his life to serve the guide who had saved him. So Christ victoriously wins the battle against evil and frees man from his sin.

At home again, the Lord's Prayer is explained in the family experience of prayer. The baptism of the little brother introduces the sacraments, and the confirmation of Elsa, his older sister, concludes the book with the Lord's Supper.

This is the second successful book by A. G. Joelsson, the gifted Swedish school teacher. His books are justly popular in Sweden, their circulation more than thirty thousand. In this country, where the

juvenile market is crowded with eye-appealing books, it is fervently hoped that this book will gain the circulation in Christian homes that it merits because it will change for the better every home that it can serve. Pastors and teachers should do everything in their power to make it known. It is a gem. It is unusually effective in preparing a child for confirmation, for stimulating family discussions on issues that matter, and as a suggestive help to show teachers how to use imagination in teaching Christianity.

GEORGE F. HALL

Channing: Day by Day. By Jose Chapiro. Boston: The Boston Press, 1948. 446 pages. \$5.00.

This might be called an "Almanac for Christian Liberals." It is a good one. The compiler has done an excellent job of selecting and arranging, and there could hardly be a richer source than Channing's writings for such a purpose. "The impassioned little saint" is impressive in the reach of his thought, the breadth and balance of his view, the universality of his sympathy, the singleness of his spirit, and the clarity of his utterance.

Ending his life in that decisive decade, the 1840's, cherished as a friend by such men as Wordsworth, Coleridge, Emerson, and Thoreau, Channing did more than speak for Unitarianism in New England. He played a great part in shaping the liberal tradition both in England and in America.

There is edification for others than liberals in the thoughtful reading of these meditations. Channing was hardly a prophet. But he was, like every great, independent, thinking artist, no apologist but a critic of his age. Van Wyck Brooks called him "the conscience of New England" because he was no better satisfied with New England than Thoreau was.

If he believed in the potential of man, he deplored all actually achieved conditions of man: "I have no eulogy to pronounce on the present condition of human

nature." If he defended man against the theology of John Calvin, he was under no illusion about man: "We see him the child of God and the victim of sin, now manifesting the disinterested love of an angel, now betraying the pride, malignity, sensuality of a demon." If he believed in the possibility of progress, he fought the certainty of stagnation, not only in religion, but also in society and politics: "We discover little knowledge of human nature if we ascribe to constitutions the power of charming to sleep the spirit of intolerance. . . . We must not conclude that we are necessarily free." If he denounced the orthodox creeds as static, he denounced a static nationalism as emphatically: "Christianity began to be corrupted at its birth, to be debased by earthly mixtures as soon as it touched the earth. . . . Unitarianism . . . began as a protest against rejection of reason—against mental slavery, . . . but it has grown stationary, and now we have a *Unitarian Orthodoxy*." It is little wonder that the shaken liberals of our day fall back on Channing; he contains correctives long since forgotten.

Such quotations could be multiplied to show that Channing was right in one point: a man is more important than his personal theology, and may be better as well as worse than it is. In the light of the hundred years since his time, we can see that his error was that of all sheer idealism. His view of human actuality was clear enough. But he could not see why every man could not be as Channing was, since God was for him, and no determinism could prevent it. In this fact, that what is possible is still not actual, lies a depth of human tragedy that no idealist can fathom.

H. GRADY DAVIS

Herdabrev till Lunds Stift. By Anders Nygren. Stockholm: Svenska Kyrkans Diakonistyrelses Bokförlag, 1949. 149 pages. Kr. 5:50.

Unfortunately only a limited number of readers will be able to enjoy this little

book because it is written in Swedish. This is to be regretted for these pastoral letters of Dr. Nygren are worth careful study and meditation because of their insight and their application to modern needs.

This illustration might make clear something of their worth. Dr. Nygren is convinced that the Gospel has come to us as a message (*budskap*). After enunciating this great truth, he reminds his readers of the day when Norway and Denmark were occupied. The time of their liberation came. The news came as a glad message to those who lived in the sister land of Sweden. Those who heard the message of freedom experienced it in great jubilation. In a hundred years, however, when the historian states it as an historical fact, it will have lost its character of a message and will be considered as a mere account of certain happenings.

This the Christian message dare not become. For man, living under the power of sin and death, the Christian Gospel comes not as a mere account, derived from a body of historical facts, but as a message of redemption, stronger than any other that we know. For God's power is stronger than all the powers of destruction.

As the reviewer puts the book aside, he realizes that the Swedish pastor, particularly one in the Diocese of Lund, is to be envied. The presidents of our synods have neither the time nor the compelling power of a great tradition to move them to write such pastoral letters for clergy and people.

BENJAMIN LOTZ

Christmas. An American Annual of Christmas Literature and Art. Edited

by Randolph E. Haugan. Volume XX. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1950. 72 pages. Paper \$1.00; cloth, \$2.00.

This is a bold and beautiful work, and this twentieth year of publication presents a volume which in point of literary content and superbly beautiful illustrations more than sustains the remarkably high character and quality established in preceding years.

The volume is of handsome folio size. Following beautifully printed accounts of the First Christmas, according to St. Luke and St. Matthew, there is a series of Christmas articles and stories, the most notable of which, perhaps, are "Candles for Christmas," "Yuletide Customs and Legends," and an excellent article on Albrecht Dürer, the sixteenth century German artist and friend of the Reformers. Then follow sections on "Christmas Poetry," "Christmas Art and Photography," and "Christmas Music," each of which has fresh and interesting material.

There is a wealth of illustrations, black and white and superb color work. The latter particularly is vigorous and very beautiful, with the simplicity, directness, and strength of the modern idiom, but in every case with the quality of reverence and deep religious feeling which we so greatly desire and so infrequently find in current Christmas literature and art. A strong Scandinavian feeling pervades the entire work and adds interest and beauty. Excellence in literary and artistic material is enhanced by the further merit that this beautiful volume definitely and designedly keeps Christ in Christmas.

LUTHER D. REED

Books Received

- Roland Bainton, *Here I Stand. A Life of Martin Luther*. Nashville: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1950. \$4.75.
- Hans Lilje, Luther, *Den nya tidens genombrott och kris*. Stockholm: Svenska Kyrkans Diakonistyrelses Bokförlag, 1950. 246 pages. Kr. 8:25.
- E. G. Schwiebert, *Luther and His Times. The Reformation from a New Perspective*. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1950. 892 pages. \$10.00.
- Anna Laura Gebhard, *Parsonage Doorway*. Nashville: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1950. 144 pages. \$1.75.
- Alan Richardson, *The Gospel and Modern Thought*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1950. 210 pages. \$2.00.
- A. B. Lentz et al., *Story of the Midwest Synod, U.L.C.A., 1890-1950*. Louisville, Nebraska: A. B. Lentz, 1950. 392 pages. \$1.50.
- Arthur Vööbus, *Communism's Challenge to Christianity*. Maywood, Illinois: Chicago Lutheran Seminary Bookstore, 1950. 98 pages. \$1.20.
- Armas K. E. Holmio, *The Finnish Missionary Society, 1859-1950*. Hancock, Michigan: Finnish Lutheran Book Concern, 1950. Paper, 26 pages.
- W. G. Polack, *Beside Still Waters*. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1950. 73 pages. \$1.25.
- Jacob Tanner, *Exploring God's Word. Study Guide to Bible Teaching*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1950. 168 pages. \$1.50.
- W. A. Poovey, *Problems that Plague the Saints*. Columbus: Wartburg Press, 1950. 184 pages. \$2.00.
- G. W. Stubbings, *A Dictionary of Church Music*. New York: Philosophical Library, 1950. 128 pages. \$3.75.
- Walter A. Maier, *One Thousand Radio Voices for Christ. Radio Messages for the Lutheran Hour*. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1950. 454 pages. \$3.00.
- Kendrick Strong, *Sagebush Circuit*. New York: Macmillan, 1950. 194 pages. \$2.50.
- Ralph D. Heim, *Leading a Sunday Church School*. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1950. 368 pages. \$4.75.
- Lynn Harold Hough, *The Dignity of Man*. Nashville: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1950. 143 pages. \$1.75.
- J. Richard Spann, ed., *Fruits of Faith*. Nashville: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1950. 240 pages. \$2.50.
- Nevin C. Harner, *About Myself*. Philadelphia: Christian Education Press, 1950. 133 pages. \$1.75.
- Daniel Nystrom, ed., *When We Pray. Prayers for Worship in the Home and for Private Devotions*. Rock Island: Augustana Book Concern, 1950. 261 pages. \$2.50.
- Theophile James Meek, *Hebrew Origins*. Revised edition. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1950. 246 pages. \$3.00.
- Rudolf Grabs, *Vördnad för Livet. Urval ur Albert Schweitzers skrifter*. Stockholm: Svenska Kyrkans Diakonistyrelses Bokförlag, 1950. 326 pages. Kr. 11:50.
- Clyde Lemont Hay, *The Blind Spot in American Public Education*. New York: Macmillan, 1950. 110 pages. \$2.00.

CONTRIBUTORS

HANS-WERNER GENSICHEN, of Hamburg, Germany, is associated with the Deutscher Evangelischer Missions-Rat.

OTTO H. BOSTROM is professor of Ecumenical Theology at Hamma Divinity School, Springfield, Ohio.

WILFRIED TAPPERT is pastor of the St. Paul's Church, U.L.C.A., in Mt. Vernon, New York.

GUSTAV F. WINGREN is a member of the theological faculty of the University of Lund, Sweden.

WILLIAM H. BAAR is pastor of the Emmanuel Evangelical Lutheran Church, New Haven, Connecticut.

MARTIN J. HEINECKEN is professor of theology at the Lutheran Theological Seminary, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

M. G. CHRISTENSEN, Omaha, Nebraska, is a pastor of the United Danish Church.

BERNHARD ERLING, Des Moines, Iowa, is a pastor of the Augustana Lutheran Church.

Among the reviewers of books in this number are ABDEL ROSS WENTZ, president of the Gettysburg Seminary; ARMIN G. WENG, president of the Chicago Lutheran Seminary in Maywood, Illinois; T. F. GULLIXSON, president of Luther Seminary in St. Paul; ALVIN D. MATTSON, professor of Ethics in Augustana Seminary, Rock Island; V. K. NIKANDER, professor of Philosophy in Wagner College, Staten Island, N. Y.; T. A. KANTONEN, professor of Systematic Theology in Hamma Divinity School, Springfield, Ohio; MERLE W. BOYER, professor of Philosophy in Carthage College, Carthage, Illinois; ARTHUR C. P. HAYS, professor of the New Testament in Northwestern Seminary, Minneapolis; JOHN P. MILTON, professor of the Old Testament in Luther Seminary, St. Paul.

THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY

Published quarterly by the Editorial Council of Lutheran Theological Seminaries and continuing *The Lutheran Quarterly*, founded in Gettysburg as *The Evangelical Review* in 1849, *The Lutheran Church Review*, founded in Philadelphia in 1882, *The Lutheran Church Quarterly*, Philadelphia and Gettysburg since 1928, and *The Augustana Quarterly*, Rock Island, Illinois, since 1922.

Editor

CONRAD BERGENDOFF
Augustana College, Rock Island, Illinois

Managing Editor

THEODORE S. LIEFELD
Capital University Seminary, Columbus, Ohio

Book Editor

THEODORE G. TAPPERT
7333 Germantown Road, Philadelphia 19, Pennsylvania

Circulation Manager

ANDREW S. BURGESS
Luther Seminary, Como Ave. and Luther Place, St. Paul, Minnesota

EDITORIAL COUNCIL

LUTHERAN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
GETTYSBURG, PA.

Harvey D. Hoover
Abdel Ross Wentz

LUTHERAN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
PHILADELPHIA, PA.

Paul J. Hoh
T. G. Tappert

AUGUSTANA THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
ROCK ISLAND, ILL.

C. G. Carlfelt
Eric Wahlstrom

CAPITAL UNIVERSITY THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
COLUMBUS, OHIO

E. C. Fendt

LUTHER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
ST. PAUL, MINN.

Andrew S. Burgess

WARTBURG THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
DUBUQUE, IOWA

Bernard Holm

VOLUME II

1950

TIMES AND NEWS PUBLISHING CO.

Index to Volume II

I. AUTHORS AND SUBJECTS

ABERLY, J.	
Review of: Planck, <i>Scientific Autobiography and Other Papers</i>	236
ALLBECK, W. D.	
Reviews of: Huggenvik, <i>We Believe</i>	221
Hazelton, <i>Renewing the Mind</i>	225
BAAR, WILLIAM H.	
Luther's Sacramental Thought	414
BACHMANN, C. CHARLES	
Lutheran Pastoral Care in America Today	45
BAUGHMAN, H. F.	
Review of: <i>Three Books of Sermons on the Trinity Season</i>	110
BECK, VICTOR E.	
"Treasures"	286
BENZ, ERNST	
Nihilism in East and West	17
BERGENDOFF, C.	
Review of: Horton, <i>Toward a Reborn Church</i>	102
Uncredited "Notes": <i>A New Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament</i>	201
<i>A Kierkegaard Fellowship</i>	207
Reviews of: <i>Kyrka och Folkbildning</i>	221
Schweitzer, <i>The Philosophy of Civilization</i>	230
BERKEMEYER, W. C.	
Review of: Beyer, <i>Christ</i>	349
BESCH, HANS	
Johann Sebastian Bach—Citizen of Two Worlds	123
BODENSIECK, J.	
Review of: Fraser, <i>Understanding the New Testament</i>	217
BOSTROM, O. H.	
Review of: Schweitzer, <i>Memoirs of Childhood and Youth</i>	118
The Status of Liturgical Music in the Churches of the National Lutheran Council	369
BOYD, R. H.	
Review of: Handy, <i>Jesus the Preacher</i>	215
BOYER, M. W.	
Review of: McEwen, <i>Enduring Satisfaction: A Philosophy of Spiritual Growth</i>	472
BUEHRING, P. H.	
Reviews of: Kettner, <i>Grossie</i>	105
Headland, <i>Ole Bull, Norwegian Minstrel</i>	213
Alleman, <i>Prisoners of Hope</i>	231
CARLFELT, C. G.	
Reviews of: Dunnington, <i>Something to Stand On</i>	212
Brunner, <i>Christianity and Civilization I, II</i>	227
CARLSON, E. M.	
Review of: Malmström, <i>En Farled</i>	355
CHINA NEWS LETTER, THE	
The Church in Communist China	
CHRIST UND WELT	
National Churches Free From Rome	92
CHRISTENSEN, M. G.	
Grundtvig and Kierkegaard	441
CONRADI, WILLIAM C.	
Extended Service	340

COOPER, C. M.	
Reviews of: Baab, <i>The Theology of the Old Testament</i>	99
May and McCown, eds., <i>A Remapping of the Bible World: Nelson's New Bible Maps</i>	234
Daniel, <i>A Critical Study of Primitive Liturgies: Especially That of St. James</i>	235
DAVIS, H. GRADY	
Review of: Chapiro, <i>Channing: Day by Day</i>	477
DELL, J. A.	
Review of: Phillips, <i>Bearing Witness to the Truth</i>	107
DURFEE, HAROLD A.	
The Social Theology of J. H. W. Stuckenberg	335
ELBERT, O.	
Review of: Rieke, <i>Sincerely, in Him</i>	214
ENGELBRECHT, A. J.	
Reviews of: Rogness, <i>The Age and You</i>	231
Lofts, <i>Women in the Old Testament</i>	235
ERLING, BERNHARD	
A Proposal for a Lutheran Graduate Seminary	450
FENDT, E. C.	
Review of: DeWolf, <i>The Religious Revolt Against Reason</i>	224
The Theology of the Common Confession	308
FLACK, E. E.	
Reviews of: Weatherhead, <i>When the Lamp Flickers</i>	113
Fosdick, <i>The Man From Nazareth</i>	216
Bernard, <i>Progress of Doctrine in the New Testament</i>	217
FORELL, G. W.	
Review of: McCrossen, <i>The New Renaissance of the Spirit</i>	237
GENSICHEN, HANS-WERNER	
The Crisis of Education on the Mission Fields	363
GRETH, MORRIS S.	
The Christian Family and the Community	135
GULLIXSON, T. F.	
Reviews of: Harkness, <i>The Gospel and Our World</i>	232
Harmon, <i>Ministerial Ethics and Etiquette</i>	473
HALL, GEORGE F.	
Review of: Joelsson, <i>A Boy Meets Luther</i>	476
HASENAUER, GERARD C.	
Christian Mysticism in the Poetry of La Martine	58
HAYS, ARTHUR C. P.	
Review of: <i>Gospel Parallels</i>	473
HEICK, OTTO H.	
The Glory That Excelleth	180
HEIKKINEN, J. W.	
Review of: Arndt, <i>From the Nile to the Waters of Damascus</i>	350
HEIM, R. D.	
Reviews of: Clinton, <i>Let's Read the Bible</i>	218
Harner, <i>Religion's Place in General Education</i>	222
HEINECKEN, MARTIN J.	
The Pre-theological Curriculum	426
HERMAN, STEWART W.	
Lutheran Service to Refugees	3
HOB, P. J.	
Reviews of: Blackwood, <i>Pastoral Leadership</i>	117
Hiltner, <i>Pastoral Counseling</i>	208
<i>A Bibliography of Practical Theology</i>	213
<i>The Life That Never Ends. Sermons</i>	219
HOOVER, H. D.	
Reviews of: Cashman, <i>The Finances of a Church</i>	111
Martin, <i>To Fulfill This Ministry</i>	208
Heuch, <i>Pastoral Care of the Sick</i>	210
HULME, WILLIAM E.	
The Psychology of Religious Prophecy	202
IVERSEN, I.	
Review of: Lebreton and Zeiller, <i>The History of the Primitive Church</i>	350

JAGNOW, A. A.	
Reviews of: Lornell, <i>Lift Up Your Hearts!</i>	111
Kunze, <i>Das Tuch der Veronika</i>	111
Bailey, <i>The Gospel in Hymns, Background and Interpretation</i>	233
KANTONEN, T. A.	
Review of: Bender, <i>A Philosophy of Life</i>	472
KAUFMANN, J. A.	
Review of: Gross, ed., <i>1949 Vacation Bible School Material</i>	234
KECK, A. H., JR.	
Review of: <i>The Obedience of One. Sermons</i>	218
KEGLEY, CHARLES W.	
Review of: Bryn-Jones, <i>The Dilemma of the Idealist</i>	469
KNUDSEN, J.	
The Problem of the Two Cups	74
KUETHE, J.	
Review of: Latko, <i>Origen's Concept of Penance</i>	106
LECHLEITNER, R. D.	
Reviews of: Force, <i>My Heart's Desire</i>	111
Spann, ed., <i>The Ministry</i>	232
LEHMANN, HELMUT T.	
Review of: MacLennan, <i>A Preacher's Primer</i>	476
LEHMANN, M. E.	
Justus Jonas—A Collaborator With Luther	189
LESKE, L. H.	
The Lutheran Church in Australia	151
LETTIS, H. C.	
Review of: Nelson, <i>The Christian Way in Race Relations</i>	211
LIEFELD, T. S.	
Review of: Bonthius, <i>Christian Paths to Self-Acceptance</i>	209
LINN, J. K.	
Review of: Preuss, <i>Die Geschichte der Abendmahlsfrömmigkeit in Zeugnissen und Berichten</i>	353
LOTZ, BENJAMIN	
Review of: Nygren, <i>Herdabrev till Lunds Stift</i>	477
LUND-QUIST, C. E.	
Review of: Dietrich, <i>Världsstrategi, Kristliga Studentvärldsförbundet</i>	358
MATTSON, A. D.	
Reviews of: Stoltz, <i>Folkets Rösti</i>	103
Wohlin, <i>Död och Levande Moral</i>	464
MATZNER, E. W.	
Reviews of: Koepp, <i>Von hohen Ethos der Brautliebe</i>	113
Wischmann, ed., <i>Der Mensch und die Mächte</i>	474
MILTON, J. P.	
Review of: Hodgkin, <i>A Pictorial Gospel</i>	474
MOOSE, JOHN B.	
Review of: Urquhart, ed., <i>Last Chance</i>	474
MUEDEKING, GEORGE H.	
The American Lutheran Church in California	85
Review of: Holman, <i>Psychology and Religion for Everyday Living</i>	108
MYERS, J. M.	
Review of: Bewer, <i>The Book of the Twelve Prophets</i>	115
NELSON, CLIFFORD ANSGAR	
Review of: Runestam, <i>Människa och Kristen</i>	468
NIKANDER, VILJO K.	
Review of: Haroutunian, <i>Lust for Power</i>	466
NOTHHACKSBERGER, O.	
Review of: Ullman, <i>Der Weg des Neunzehnten Jahrhunderts</i>	355
PELIKAN, JAROSLAV	
Doctrine of Man in the Lutheran Confessions	34
REED, LUTHER D.	
Reviews of: Beckmann et al., <i>Kirchenagende I, Band I</i>	115
Haugan, ed., <i>Christmas. An American Annual of Christmas Literature and Art</i>	478
Introduction to the New Common Liturgy	253

REINSCHÉ, R. H.	
Exegesis of Ephesians 2:1-7	70
ROGNESS, A. N.	
Theological Trends in Mid-Century America	243
RYDEN, E. E.	
The Common Hymnal: Historical Background and Guiding Principles	269
SAARNIVAARA, UURAA S	
Written and Spoken Word	166
Review of: Bonhoeffer, <i>Ethik</i>	461
SCHIOTZ, FREDRICK A.	
Lutheran World Missions	64
SEAMAN, W. R.	
Review of: Kildahl, <i>Thy Rod and Thy Staff</i>	220
SELTZER, G. R.	
Reviews of: Morgan, <i>Man's Restless Search</i>	113
Newman, <i>The Private Devotions of Launcelot Andrewes</i>	220
Pratt, <i>Eternal Values in Religion</i>	467
SITTLER, J., JR.	
Reviews of: Watson, <i>Let God Be God!</i>	354
Barth, <i>Dogmatics in Outline</i>	465
STAMM, R. T.	
Reviews of: Knox, <i>Trials of a Translator</i>	101
Keppler, <i>Contemporary Thinking About Paul: An Anthology</i>	343
Knox, <i>Chapters in a Life of Paul</i>	345
STEINTHAL, ERIC	
The Physician and the Minister	287
STIREWALT, M. L.	
Review of: Suechting, ed., <i>Thine Forever</i>	234
TAPPERT, T. G.	
Reviews of: Clark, <i>The Small Sects in America</i>	212
Peterson, <i>Lutheranism and the Educational Ethic</i>	222
Holmio, <i>The Lutheran Reformation and the Jews</i>	223
Eister, <i>Drawing-Room Conversion. A Sociological Account of the Oxford Movement</i>	461
Uncredited Book Reviews: <i>Viewpoints. Contemporary Issues of Thought and Life</i>	224
Inge, <i>Diary of a Dean, St. Paul's 1911-34</i>	235
TAPPERT, WILFRIED	
Volition in Christian Life and Doctrine	382
TRAYER, A. J.	
Review of: Ressmeyer, <i>Headline News</i>	213
UTHE, EDWARD W.	
The State and Religious Education	324
WAHLSTROM, E. H.	
Reviews of: Bonhoeffer, <i>The Cost of Discipleship</i>	98
Sperry, <i>Jesus, Then and Now</i>	214
Historical Criticism, the Bible and the Word of God	297
Review of: Rundblom, <i>Resans mål var Kina</i>	357
WENG, ARMIN G.	
Reviews of: Macfarland, <i>Christian Unity in the Making</i>	457
Armstrong, <i>The Great Awakening in Nova Scotia, 1776-1809</i>	460
WENTZ, A. R.	
Reviews of: Kramm, <i>The Theology of Martin Luther</i>	104
Boehm, <i>We Survived</i>	223
Schlyter, <i>Karl Gützlaff als Missionar in China</i>	356
Ross, <i>Addressed to Christians: Isolationism vs. World Community</i>	457
Wallace, <i>The Muhlenbergs of Pennsylvania</i>	458
WINGREN, GUSTAV	
The Theology of Einar Billing	396
WOLF, C. U.	
Review of: Buber, <i>The Prophetic Faith</i>	114
YOCHUM, H. L.	
Review of: Newbigin, <i>The Reunion of the Church</i>	102

II. BOOKS REVIEWED

Alleman, <i>Prisoners of Hope</i>	231
Armstrong, <i>The Great Awakening in Nova Scotia, 1776-1809</i>	460
Arndt, <i>From the Nile to the Waters of Damascus</i>	350
Baab, <i>The Theology of the Old Testament</i>	99
Bailey, <i>The Gospel in Hymns. Background and Interpretation</i>	233
Barth, <i>Dogmatics in Outline</i>	465
Beckman et al., <i>Kirchenagende I, Band I</i>	115
Bender, <i>A Philosophy of Life</i>	472
Bernard, <i>Progress of Doctrine in the New Testament</i>	217
Bewer, <i>The Book of the Twelve Prophets</i>	115
Beyer, <i>Christ</i>	349
Blackwood, <i>Pastoral Leadership</i>	117
Boehm, <i>We Survived</i>	223
Bonhoeffer, <i>The Cost of Discipleship</i>	98
Bonhoeffer, <i>Ethik</i>	461
Bonthius, <i>Christian Paths to Self-Acceptance</i>	209
Brunner, <i>Christianity and Civilization, I, II</i>	227
Bryn-Jones, <i>The Dilemma of the Idealist</i>	469
Buber, <i>The Prophetic Faith</i>	114
Cashman, <i>The Finances of a Church</i>	111
Chapiro, <i>Channing: Day by Day</i>	477
Clark, <i>The Small Sects in America</i>	212
Clinton, <i>Let's Read the Bible</i>	218
Daniel, <i>A Critical Study of Primitive Liturgies: Especially That of St. James</i>	235
De Wolf, <i>The Religious Revolt Against Reason</i>	224
Dietrich, <i>Världsstrategi, Kristliga Studentvärldsförbundet</i>	358
Dunnington, <i>Something to Stand On</i>	212
Eister, <i>Drawing-Room Conversion. A Sociological Account of the Oxford Movement</i>	461
Force, <i>My Heart's Desire</i>	111
Fosdick, <i>The Man From Nazareth</i>	216
Fraser, <i>Understanding the New Testament Gospel Parallels</i>	473
Gross, ed., <i>1949 Vacation Bible School Material</i>	234
Handy, <i>Jesus the Preacher</i>	215
Harkness, <i>The Gospel and Our World</i>	232
Harmon, <i>Ministerial Ethics and Etiquette</i>	473
Harner, <i>Religion's Place in General Education</i>	222
Haroutunian, <i>Lust for Power</i>	466
Haugan, ed., <i>Christmas. An American Annual of Christmas Literature and Art</i>	478
Hazelton, <i>Renewing the Mind</i>	225
Headland, <i>Ole Bull, Norwegian Minstrel</i>	213
Heuch, <i>Pastoral Care of the Sick</i>	210
Hiltner, <i>Pastoral Counseling</i>	208
Hodgkin, <i>A Pictorial Gospel</i>	474
Holman, <i>Psychology and Religion for Everyday Living</i>	108
Holmio, <i>The Lutheran Reformation and the Jews</i>	223
Horton, <i>Toward a Reborn Church</i>	102
Huggenvik, <i>We Believe</i>	221
Inge, <i>Diary of a Dean, St. Paul's, 1911-1934</i>	235
Joelsson, <i>A Boy Meets Luther</i>	476
Kepler, <i>Contemporary Thinking About Paul: An Anthology</i>	343
Kettner, <i>Grossie</i>	105
Kildahl, <i>Thy Rod and Thy Staff</i>	220
Knox, <i>Trials of a Translator</i>	101
Knox, <i>Chapters in a Life of Paul</i>	345
Koepp, <i>Von hohen Ethos der Brautliebe</i>	112
Kramm, <i>The Theology of Martin Luther</i>	104

Kunze, <i>Das Tuch der Veronika</i>	111
Latko, <i>Origen's Concept of Penance</i>	106
Lebreton and Zeiller, <i>The History of the Primitive Church</i>	350
Lofts, <i>Women in the Old Testament</i>	235
Lornell, <i>Lift Up Your Hearts!</i>	111
Macfarland, <i>Christian Unity in the Making</i>	457
MacLennan, <i>A Preacher's Primer</i>	476
McEwen, <i>Enduring Satisfaction: A Philosophy of Spiritual Growth</i>	472
Malmström, <i>En Farled</i>	355
Martin, <i>To Fulfill This Ministry</i>	208
May and McCown, eds., <i>A Remapping of the Bible World; Nelson's New Bible Maps</i>	234
McCrossen, <i>The New Renaissance of the Spirit</i>	237
Morgan, <i>Man's Restless Search</i>	113
Nelson, <i>The Christian Way in Race Relations</i>	211
Newbiggin, <i>The Reunion of the Church</i>	102
Newman, <i>The Private Devotions of Lancelot Andrewes</i>	220
Nygren, <i>Herdabrev till Lunds Stift</i>	477
Peterson, <i>Lutheranism and the Educational Ethic</i>	222
Phillips, <i>Bearing Witness to the Truth</i>	107
Planck, <i>Scientific Autobiography and Other Papers</i>	236
Pratt, <i>Eternal Values in Religion</i>	467
Preuss, <i>Die Geschichte der Abendmahlsfrömmigkeit in Zeugnissen und Berichten</i>	353
Ressmeyer, <i>Headline News</i>	213
Rieke, <i>Sincerely, in Him</i>	214
Rogness, <i>The Age and You</i>	231
Ross, <i>Addressed to Christians: Isolationism vs. World Community</i>	457
Rundblom, <i>Resans mål var Kina</i>	357
Runestam, <i>Människa och Kristen</i>	468
Schlyter, <i>Karl Gützlaff als Missionar in China</i>	356
Schweitzer, <i>Memoirs of Childhood and Youth</i>	118
Schweitzer, <i>The Philosophy of Civilization</i>	230
Spann, ed., <i>The Ministry</i>	232
Sperry, <i>Jesus, Then and Now</i>	214
Stoltz, <i>Folkets Röst</i>	103
Suechting, ed., <i>Thine Forever</i>	234
Ullman, <i>Der Weg des Neunzehnten Jahrhunderts</i>	355
Urquhart, ed., <i>Last Chance</i>	474
Wallace, <i>The Muhlenbergs of Pennsylvania</i>	458
Watson, <i>Let God Be God!</i>	354
Weatherhead, <i>When the Lamp Flickers</i>	113
Wischmann, ed., <i>Der Mensch und die Mächte</i>	474
Wohlin, <i>Död och Levande Moral</i>	464

